

B
29
M17
1934

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

BY
JOHN MACMURRAY

WITH A PREFACE BY
C. A. SIEPMANN



D. APPLETON-CENTURY COMPANY
INCORPORATED
NEW YORK

1934

PRINTED AND MADE IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

PREFACE BY C. A. SIEPMANN	6
INTRODUCTION	9
THE MODERN DILEMMA	
I IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?	15
II SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?	26
III THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE	38
IV A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD	50
REALITY AND FREEDOM	
INTRODUCTORY PAMPHLET	67
I ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS	101
II ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY	112
III THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY	121
IV ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING	130
V ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS	141
VI ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE	151
VII ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY BEING FREE	163
VIII ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM	171
IX MECHANICAL MORALITY	181
X SOCIAL MORALITY	189
XI PERSONAL MORALITY	199
XII THE FINAL SUMMARY: SELF-REALIZATION	207

PREFACE BY C. A. SIEPMANN

THIS BOOK is unusual in that publication can but extend and enhance its reputation, which precedes it. All but the first four chapters (which were a contribution in January 1932 to the series of wireless talks on 'The Modern Dilemma') were written and broadcast in the summer of 1930. They aroused widespread interest and some controversy. They also added one more to the select list of broadcast speakers who have become household names. For me the negotiation of that summer series remains a vivid and delightful memory. For it was the occasion of my first meeting with John Macmurray. At my request he came to see me at Savoy Hill. I remember the room (very official), the chair in which he sat (also grimly official), the interruptions of colleagues and office boys and telephone bells. We sat as strangers, a little on the defensive, with the wariness of first acquaintance. I told him of our needs and hopes and we discussed philosophy and the difficulty of making dry bones live. We warmed to our subject and to one another. A few minutes later the author of this book sat speaking at a microphone in what was then No. 6 studio; and with the dispassionate inhumanity of the broadcasting official I remember sitting with a colleague weighing the quality and substance of that quiet voice with the endearing Scottish brogue which came to us through our headphones. Well, he *might* do, we coldly calculated! I recall these details because they were incidents of a first acquaintance which has since ripened to friendship, a friendship which alone

PREFACE

can justify my privilege in writing this short preface. Nor are such personal recollections wholly irrelevant. For the contagion of personality which then made a warmth out of the chill of first acquaintance and sensitive reserve has since become part of the experience of many who will be readers of this book. Few would have expected that at the height of a beguiling summer and at the unlikely hour of eight of the evening twelve broadcast talks on Philosophy would have produced a miniature renaissance among thousands of English listeners. In that sense, at least, the talks made broadcast history. The pamphlet which introduced them and which is here republished became a 'best-seller'. The letters which came from listeners in all parts of the country and in all classes showed that a voice 'spiriting the dumb inane with the quick matter of life', had done its work and vindicated the faith and hope of officials plying what is surely the most speculative trade in all the world. For there is something of that expectant hope and apprehension in the launching of every broadcast series.

Of the philosophical validity of what is printed in this book I feel wholly incompetent to speak. It is for me to record the impressions which correspondence (and it was considerable) and contact with men and women who had listened to the talks, has left with me. For every generation certain aspects of truth have a particular significance. Though the goal is constant, the difficulties on the road vary at every stage. It is as much in escaping from these obstacles as in perception of the goal itself that we must be served by leaders and by men of vision. What was impressive about these broadcast talks was the emo-

PREFACE

tional intensity of the response to a new challenge to self-examination. I believe much of the virtue that is in these pages lies in the fact that they speak a language undistorted by false associations. What is evident above all else in our present state is that the old appeals are vain. They have lost touch with life; their very language bespeaks 'a creed out-worn', and we shall do well to stop blaming those who have ceased to listen and find, in time, the language and that aspect of truth which can touch men's hearts without alienating their reason. [What the younger generation, if I read them aright, demand of us is that we shall be more honest with ourselves. It is sick of the compromise that permits and indeed endorses the discrepancy between what we profess in our creeds and what we advocate as expedient in our public life.] The strength of the appeal of what is written here lies in the fact that it claims that what we need is a faith at once truer to our own inwardness and more exacting in its demand upon our performance. Here is a challenge to a more pitiless and candid self-analysis than custom has always found it convenient to admit.

The talks largely through misunderstanding were held in certain quarters to be revolutionary and even disruptive, but I doubt if they are more revolutionary than truth has ever been when men have dared to apply it as the touchstone of life and conduct. The virtue of cold print is that it enables us to ponder the significance of visions recollected in tranquillity and I for one believe that the publication of these talks will help many to that re-discovery of reality for which the times are ripe.

C. A. SIEPMANN.

INTRODUCTION

THIS VOLUME contains two series of philosophical talks which were broadcast from London, and the contents of the introductory pamphlet which was published by the British Broadcasting Corporation as an introduction to one of the series. The four talks on 'The Modern Dilemma' were broadcast in January, 1932. The twelve talks on 'Reality and Freedom' were delivered in the spring and summer of 1930.

I have decided to publish these talks as the result of considerable pressure from friends and correspondents who have expressed the desire to have them for reference in a permanent form, and the wish that they should be available for others who did not hear them delivered. It has been difficult to convince myself that it is desirable to issue them in book form. The more suitable a series of talks is for its original purpose, the less likely it is to be suitable for literary publication. The conditions imposed by the broadcasting of a continuous series of talks on a single theme are peculiar. The audience is shifting, heterogeneous and unknown. This not only forces the broadcaster to

INTRODUCTION

aim at an extreme simplification of expression, and a considerable simplification of thought, and to rely upon the effectiveness of the living voice for emphasis and elucidation; it also involves a considerable amount of repetition, since each talk must be made as complete in itself as may be. The form of exposition which results is apt to be a little misleading, if the talks are read rather than heard, as well as unpleasing in their literary presentation. The request for a published record puts their author on the horns of a dilemma: either he must publish the talks as they were delivered, with all the defects of literary form which this entails; or he must write a book on the same theme which will not be a true record of the talks. The middle course of adapting the talks to literary exposition seems to me to offer the disadvantages of both alternatives and the advantages of neither.

I have chosen, therefore, to publish the talks as nearly in the form in which they were delivered as my records permit. Certain slight modifications of expression which were made in the course of delivery are necessarily irrecoverable. Certain passages which were omitted during the actual broadcasts to economize time have been retained where they help to clarify the meaning. But apart from such minor differences the printed version is a verbal reproduction of what was said at the microphone.

The substance of the talks is a treatment of what seem to me to be the fundamental issues facing any

INTRODUCTION

real philosophy at the present time. I say *real* philosophy advisedly, since the problems on which I have concentrated are not the central problems of the academic tradition. Philosophy becomes real, and, therefore, of interest and importance to those who are not specialists in the subject, only when its problems are forced upon it by the immediate life of its time and its environment. The first essential for a living philosophy is thus a diagnosis of the philosophical problem presented by contemporary life. It is for this reason that I have set the talks on 'The Modern Dilemma', which were the more recently delivered, in the forefront of the book. These four talks, and the essay introducing the series on 'Reality and Freedom', both attempt, from different angles, to define the objective problem of contemporary thought. The final series of twelve talks is an effort to suggest the lines on which this problem may be resolved.

There exists in some quarters a prejudice against the attempt to 'popularize' philosophy; a prejudice which I myself formerly shared, at least to the extent of fearing that the attempt would prove impossible without a cheapening and falsification of the issues. The result of my broadcasting experience has been to convince me that, however unsuccessful my own attempts may have been, the prejudice is quite groundless. There is no inherent impossibility in the effort to expound the central issues of philosophy in a fashion which will render them comprehensible to the un-

INTRODUCTION

initiated. Simplification there must be and a strenuous avoidance of abstractions and technicalities. But this is not a defect, since philosophy is the most concrete of all sciences, and its major effort is the simplification of complex issues. The immediate difficulty facing the broadcast philosopher is the simplification of expression. He must turn from abstraction to exemplification. He must eschew technical terms and speak plain English. He must translate the specialism of his accustomed phraseology into the living vernacular. This is undoubtedly a task of extreme difficulty. But the difficulty lies not in the nature of things, nor in the inherent inadequacy of common speech, but rather in the inability of the philosopher to apprehend the living meaning, the concrete reference of the terminology which he has learned to use. It is possible to philosophise truly and well without understanding the meaning of one's own thought (though only within limits), somewhat as it is possible to be a good mathematician without understanding the meaning of one's own mathematical results in the interpretation of nature. The difference between the two cases is that while the developments of pure mathematics may or may not have a concrete reference to the real world, those of pure philosophy must have such a reference or be false and worthless. When I undertook the task of expressing my own philosophy in non-philosophical language, I found, with considerable astonishment, how vague was my own apprehension of the real meaning of technical

INTRODUCTION

terms which I habitually used with considerable precision. The attempt to discover their meaning proved to be the finest philosophical discipline to which I have ever submitted, and of more value for the understanding of philosophy than any scholarly study of classical texts. Whatever may be the value of 'popularizing' philosophy to the general public, it certainly holds a rich harvest for the philosopher. It forces him to an activity from which he customarily shrinks because it recalls him from the tenuous abstractions of concentrated logical processes—to an activity parallel to that which has proved the life-blood of progress in the natural sciences, the verification of results by reference to concrete fact. Where the effort to popularize philosophy is a sincere effort of self-expression the philosopher will find himself forced, not into superficiality, but into a deeper realization of his own meaning.

Of the value of these talks to others than myself I am much more sceptical. But the criticisms and comments which they have brought me from all parts of the country and from all classes of the community encourage me to believe that they have proved interesting and stimulating to many who heard them, and may prove so to others who did not. This is my only excuse for their publication in book form. At least it provides me with a welcome opportunity to express my indebtedness to the British Broadcasting Corporation for the opportunities they have given me and for the sympathetic co-operation which they provided

INTRODUCTION

throughout the preparation and production of these talks. In particular I have to thank Mr. C. A. Siepmann, whose enthusiasm for broadcast education conceived the plan of the talks, and whose energy and courage surmounted the difficulties in the way of its execution. My thanks are also due to Dr. E. Sideropoulo for her help in preparing the manuscript for the press and in correcting the proofs.

14th April, 1932

University College, London

THE MODERN DILEMMA

I

IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?

I WONDER how many of my listeners will agree with the B.B.C., as I do, that we moderns are on the horns of a dilemma. That we are in a muddle, that there is some kind of crisis upon us, that we are faced with difficulties that we find it hard to solve, we shall all agree. But a dilemma is something different. That means that we are faced with a choice between two alternatives, neither of which is pleasant. We don't want to choose either, since it is a choice between two evils. We are in two minds; we are pulled in two directions at once; and we are paralysed in our activity because we cannot make up our minds to accept either alternative. That is what it means to be in a dilemma, and that, my friends, is the situation we find ourselves in to-day.

What our dilemma really is I shall try to explain in these four talks. But first I should like to say a word about the necessity of facing it. For it is quite possible to refuse the choice, to run away from the dilemma. It is quite possible to pretend that it isn't necessary to choose; that things will all come right if we leave them

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

alone and do nothing about it. On the whole that is what we are trying to do. In every department of our lives, individually and socially, we are playing a game of bluff, indulging in a gigantic game of make-believe, trying to persuade ourselves that everything is really all right, or that it will come all right if we only leave things alone and carry on as usual. That, I think, is the most disastrous course of all. Nelson, on a famous occasion, put his blind eye to the telescope, but he kept the other one wide open. It was the expression of a dangerous and courageous choice. We shut both eyes, lest we should have to make a choice that calls for courage and decision. How many of us remember that one of the things the War convinced us of was the necessity of open diplomacy and the dangers of secrecy in public affairs? It is a strange commentary upon that conviction that we are now putting our faith—if we can dignify it by the name of faith—in increasing secrecy and in the growth of the spirit of censorship. What does that mean? Surely that we don't want to face the facts ourselves, in their stark crudity. Perhaps that is the centre of the modern dilemma. We are a democracy faced with the gravest issues that history has ever produced, with the most marvellous opportunities for great action and great success; and we are incapable of acting greatly because it involves a resolute choice and a drastic choice. We want instead to be saved from the necessity of making it. Well! my friends, I am quite certain of one thing, and that is that the critical situation we

IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?

are in will get worse and worse until we make up our minds to drag the facts into the light and face our dilemma squarely. The great issues of life can only be dealt with greatly.

We excuse ourselves from the necessity of choice and action by dwelling upon the difficulties of our situation. The modern world is, we say, extremely complicated. The international situation is very delicate. The network of finance is terribly intricate, so that only experts can understand it. We are in the grip of inscrutable forces that are too strong for us; and so on. But these are only excuses. You know very well how, in our private lives, we always find a marshalled host of difficulties to prevent us doing things that we don't want to do. The difficulties are the reflection of our own desire to avoid action. The moment we decide to act we find that the difficulties have vanished or become manageable. It is the same with our national and social problems. They seem just a nest of insoluble difficulties that are too strong for us. In fact, we can solve them all, without very much difficulty, the moment we decide to do so. We have the knowledge, the material, the skill and the experience that is necessary, in abundant measure, but we have not the will to decide or the decision to act.

I have in mind, as you no doubt have, the crisis which we are facing (or refusing to face) in our economic and industrial activities. I want to say a little about that; but the main thing is that these

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

economic troubles are relatively unimportant. They are not the source of our dilemma, they are merely symptoms. The real trouble lies deeper. We shall never solve our economic troubles till we have solved the dilemma in our spiritual life which produces them. One has only to look at them quite superficially to see that they are quite unreal problems in themselves. Take the financial problem to start with. These modern industrial nations of ours are wealthy beyond the wildest dreams of all past generations. We have hardly wakened up to the extent of our wealth, particularly our potential wealth. What, then, is our problem? We are all over head and ears in debt, facing financial collapse and bankruptcy, millions of our people on the verge of starvation! I put it to you that such a problem is obviously unreal, and must have madness at its roots. It is impossible to be so wealthy that you are in danger of starvation. Look at the industrial side of the situation. There we have, we are told, a double problem: on the one hand the problem of over-production; on the other hand, as the result of that, the problem of vast and chronic unemployment. Now put that in plain English. We have produced such a surplus of goods that we cannot supply a large part of our population with more than the barest necessities of life. That must be nonsense. The remedies proposed in many quarters have the hall-mark of Bedlam plainly stamped upon them. We are advised to stimulate employment by the restriction of output, or even by the deliberate destruction

IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?

of our surplus production. Think what that means. We are to cure our poverty by destroying our surplus wealth, by deliberately making ourselves poorer. Or there is the economy cure: there is too much wealth on the market, therefore let us buy less. Or take the international side of it: other countries owe us so much that we must take strenuous measures to prevent them paying. If we let them pay we shall be ruined. We must set our faces against 'dumping'. What does that mean in plain English? It means that foreign producers want to sell us goods so cheaply that we shall be ruined if we buy them!

It seems as clear as daylight to me, when I look at these facts, that there is no real problem in our economic or financial situation itself. Poverty cannot be the effect of an increase of wealth; nor can bankruptcy be the result of surplus of goods. When such a situation as we are in produces problems of a magnitude that is scaring us out of our wits, then there is insanity about. These difficulties have their source in us. There is nowhere else for their source to be. If we confess, as I think we must, that we are living in a world that has gone mad, we have to remember that madness is a malady of the human mind. The world outside us can't be mad: only the world inside us is capable of sanity and insanity. Plainly, there is something serious the matter with us. We have lost our hold on reality, and the world will continue to reflect the Bedlam inside us until we recover our sanity.

That is the first stage in our search for the modern

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

dilemma, and I hope that it carries conviction. Its conclusion is that the dilemma is in us, not in external circumstances; 'the fault is in ourselves, not in our stars, that we are underlings'. Obviously the next step must be an attempt to diagnose the trouble in our own minds. What is it? What is the matter with us that prevents us from standing up like men and laughing at the ghosts that haunt our sick fancies? Why are we making such a mess of things when all the circumstances are in our favour?

I shall give you my own answer to this question right away. We have lost our faith, and when we lose faith we lose the power of action; we lose the capacity of choice, we lose our grip on reality and so our sanity. Let me explain a little what I mean. All insanity is a disorder of the mind just because sanity is essentially a matter of order, of harmony, of balance and proportion. Now you cannot have order without some organizing principle, and when the order or sanity we are considering is concerned with our own living, its principle must be a principle of valuation. Take a very simple case. Suppose I am a lady who goes shopping at one of the big stores. I want to buy a hat; and I am shown ten hats, all of which I like. If I am to buy sanely, how must I proceed? I must select one. But which? The best one, all things considered, style, fit, price, colour, the purpose for which I want it and so on. I must reckon up the value to me of each of the hats, make up my mind which is best worth having and choose that one and buy it. I must

IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?

arrange the hats in an order of value, on some principle of valuation. Now suppose that I manage in this way to reduce my choice to two of the hats. It is to be one of the two, but which? One of them is just perfect for colour, but its shape doesn't quite satisfy me. The other has an exquisite shape, but the colour is just off. I find myself in a dilemma; and my capacity to decide between them is paralysed. What is the trouble? Just that I can find no principle of valuation, nothing which will enable me to make up my mind which of the two is the more worth having. And in that case we know what is likely to happen. I shall probably have my mind made up for me by something quite accidental and regret it afterwards.

Now turn from small things to big. A person's faith is his supreme principle of valuation. It is only by our faith that we can decide what is most worth having in life, among all the things that are worth having. Without a faith, I shall find everything that attracts me in life equally valuable and I shall be without the capacity to choose between them. I shall be governed by my likes and dislikes; and as these shift and change by the accidents of the changing world in which we live, I shall be without unity of purpose, tossed about from one accidental want to another. And the life that is without a persistent and controlling principle of order in its choices is a life without order and without sanity. A society without a common faith is in a like case. It is without inner unity, without the power to choose and to stand by

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

its choice. It will be divided against itself; and a house divided against itself cannot stand.

Now our trouble is that we have lost our faith. There is nothing that we clearly, supremely and continuously believe in and are willing to stake our lives upon. And until we find a faith to live by life will continue to be too much for us. We shall be at the mercy of the 'inexorable laws' that we hear so much about. We shall be without the power of selection—like bad wireless sets that have no selectivity and respond to every vibration that strikes their aerials. And we shall go on pitying ourselves and commiserating with ourselves and blaming circumstances or other nations or other people for the troubles that are merely the reflection of our own inner lack of power to act decisively. When I look back upon our national history during and since the war I am forced, indeed, to the conclusion that we richly deserve all the troubles that have come upon us, and that so far, at least, history has let us off lightly.

This sort of thing has been said before: and we have had plenty of exhortations to recover our faith. But we feel rightly that it is not so simple a matter. The other side of it is equally important, and it is this: men and women cannot believe to order. A faith is not a thing that we can force upon ourselves or accept ready made. It must be really credible: that is the first thing. It must make direct and obvious contact with the circumstances of our daily life: that is the second. And the third is the most impor-

IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?

tant of all—it must draw to itself the whole current of our emotional life, and release it in a flood of spontaneous and joyful activity. It must make us believe in life, believe in living, and believe in our own living selves. It is no use to offer us a faith that does not do these things; it is no use pretending to accept a faith that cannot unify the whole activity of our lives in just the circumstances of the modern world. And the faith we have lived by hitherto has failed us. That is why we are in a dilemma. We cannot any longer really believe in the things that our fathers lived by. If we are to recover our faith, it will have to be a faith that *we* can live by, individually and as a world of men and women. For the first thing that a faith must do to us is to make life supremely worth living.

Think of some of the things that we used to believe in. Before the war we really believed in democracy. I mean that we believed in trusting the people to decide great issues for themselves and for the politicians. Do we believe in democracy now? Don't we rather cry out for somebody to save us, to protect us, to take the big decisions for us? Do you think that a pre-War government could have gone to the country asking for a free hand with any prospect of success? I don't. But do we believe in autocracy either, which is the alternative to democracy? We don't: and if we did, is there any man that we can think of whom we would accept with a sense of joy and enthusiasm as dictator? Then we used to believe in progress. Do we

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

really believe in it any longer? Oh! I know we still talk about it and want it to go on—but is it a faith for us? Does it grip our emotions and throw us in an urgent enthusiasm into work for progressive causes? What are we prepared to sacrifice for progress?—because that is, of course, the measure of our faith in anything. We do not believe in war, but do we believe in peace? Does the struggle to make an end of war—of armaments, soldiers and sailors, and all the stupid paraphernalia of war—thrill us with a crusading spirit? Quite obviously not. Do we believe in freedom in the way the men who freed the slaves believed in it? For we must notice this about a faith, that you can't really believe in anything for yourself without believing in it for other people. Do we, for instance, believe in freedom for India? I hardly think so. But do we then believe in refusing freedom for India? Of course we don't. Can you think of anything that we used to believe in that we still believe in passionately and with our whole hearts? I can't. Everywhere I look I find the same absence of faith. Our ideals seem to have gone dead; we no longer believe in them; and we don't disbelieve in them either. That is our dilemma. We neither believe nor disbelieve. We are neither hot nor cold; and it paralyses our capacity to decide and to act.

Don't misunderstand me. We still assent to these old faiths—most of us. We still go on working for democracy and progress and humanitarian causes and peace, and so on. We still believe in these things

IS THERE A MODERN DILEMMA?

with our heads—at least the majority of us do; that is to say, we give our assent to them. But we don't believe in them with our hearts. We can't. So they appear to us as tasks, as duties that must be performed, to which we must steel ourselves, suppressing the emotional cravings for something else, we don't know quite what, to rest perhaps, to enjoy the immediate moment, to dream or to play, or simply to sit back and watch. We *think* that the old ideals are right; and we want them carried through. We don't want people to be poor and out-of-work, or sick, or miserable, or enslaved. We want progress to go on and we want science and religion to flourish. But we don't feel an urgent eagerness in ourselves to do these things. That is why we pass resolutions and set up committees and organizations to do them for us: and, of course, they can't. An organization—even a government—can only be the spearhead of a great human drive. We have to be the force behind the thrust, or it will never go home.

I shall end here. Because I have reached the point that I want to spend the next talk upon. The dilemma has shown itself as a split between head and heart, between our thoughts and our feelings. And that, I believe, is the crux of the problem. What has caused this disunity between our intellectual and our emotional life, which pulls us in opposite directions and threatens to destroy us? Has it anything to do with the much-discussed struggle between Science and Religion?

THE MODERN DILEMMA

II

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

IN MY last talk I attempted to show you that the difficulties which we are facing in the modern world are really the reflection of a dilemma in our inner life. The dilemma is, in fact, the result of our inability to choose between the alternatives that face us, which in its turn is the result of our inability to *feel* the real value of the things that we still believe in with our heads. In fact, the root of the dilemma is in a detachment of our emotional life from our intellectual conclusions. I suggested that this was not unconnected with the struggle between science and religion. Let us follow up this clue.

Let us face the fact, and face it squarely, that there *is* a struggle between science and religion. There is a lot of learned talk about which tries to show that science and religion are not in conflict, and cannot be. In the abstract that may be all right, but in the concrete it is obvious nonsense. It is, no doubt, true that perfect science and perfect religion would be at one, but *our* science and *our* religion are in collision all along the line. The effort to show that they are not

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

is part of our attempt to avoid seeing the modern dilemma by shutting our eyes tight. For we must notice that the struggle is not between science, with a capital S, and religion, with a capital R, fighting a ghostly battle in the blue; nor is it a struggle between scientists and clergymen. It is a personal conflict that goes on all the time in your mind and in mine. Can I believe wholeheartedly, at the same time, in religion and in modern science? That is the question: and it is no academic question either, for it is concerned with action. Take one very obvious example, the science of eugenics. We already know enough about the conditions which govern the successful mating and breeding of human beings, about heredity and so on, to raise quite practical questions. Are we to be scientific about this question and apply our knowledge for the benefit of the human race? Shall we breed a future generation on scientific principles, forbidding the marriage of people with inheritable diseases, encouraging the scientific use of contraceptives, permitting the divorce of couples whose marriage has proved biologically unsuitable, and so on? Something in us recoils from the thought, something that is closely bound up with our religious feelings. That is only one particularly obvious example, and it will serve to point the moral. The scientific spirit and the religious spirit are different: they tend towards two quite different conceptions of life and of the world, and they tend to issue in quite different ways of living. The Bolsheviki in Russia

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

found, when they began that great attempt to re-organize Russia scientifically, that they were fighting religion: they concluded that their success would depend on inculcating in the young a scientific frame of mind rather than a religious one. And whatever we may think of their aims and methods and prospects of success, we have to admit that they have succeeded in setting free a spirit of decision and energy and action on a vast scale: which is just what we are failing to do. So we come back to our dilemma. The scientific spirit in us and the religious spirit are subtly antagonistic and tend to negate one another, so that our capacity for decision and action is paralysed. We cannot surrender either, and the effort to believe in both at once results in our believing effectively in neither.

It is worth while to remember that the history of science in the modern world has been one long struggle with religion, and that slowly and steadily, science has been winning. There was a long struggle with religion for the right to investigate the truth about the physical world. That battle science has won outright, because none of us now looks to religion for our knowledge of the physical world. We look to science. Then there was a struggle over the scientific investigation of life which lasted almost to our own days, centring round the theory of evolution. Science has won that battle. It is to science that we look now, not to religion, for our understanding of the processes of life and for the healing of our diseases. Religion has

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

taken refuge in the citadel of personality; and now, in our own day, science has joined issue with religion there; it has entered the domain of human experience in psychology and sociology. Science is now attacking the citadel of religion—the human soul. If it wins there, then religion is finished; it must capitulate completely.

Notice two things in this connection. First that religion is on the defensive and the battle is half-won before it is properly begun. In the last great battle the Prime Minister of England, Gladstone, fought publicly against science on the side of religion. Can you imagine, to-day, a Prime Minister of this country taking sides publicly against science? And in a great many quarters religion is trying to make terms with science. That means, I think, that science is going to win. And, secondly, notice what the triumph of science in this field must mean. We shall turn to science for a knowledge of ourselves. We shall learn to think of ourselves and of one another scientifically; to look straight at the tangle of our own motives; to face the truth about our own desires and tendencies without bias in our own favour and to confess it to one another. It would mean, as it is already beginning to mean, the dissolution of a great many of our cherished ideals, of the pretences by which we keep up a better idea of ourselves than the facts warrant, the abolition of humbug. The thought attracts and fascinates us, but it also repels us; for we have a shrewd and perfectly correct suspicion that it would upset a good

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

part of the basis of our individual and social lives, of our political organization and of our moral ideas. It would involve, in fact, a fundamental revolution in our habits and customs, in our ideas and beliefs. Knowing that, even if only obscurely, we are in a dilemma. We can neither accept science wholeheartedly nor reject it. For we are committed to science, that is to say, we are committed to knowledge and to sanity.

It looks, does it not, as if we were faced with a choice between science and religion, and that our reluctance to throw religion overboard was only cowardice and obscurantism. But wait a moment. We haven't seen the whole extent of our dilemma yet. We have only looked at it from the scientific side. Suppose we were courageously to throw religion overboard and put our faith wholeheartedly in science, what would be the result? Just this: we should have destroyed the support upon which science rests. We should have abandoned science itself.

To understand this we must first remind ourselves of the limitations of science, which make it completely useless as a faith. Let us be rigidly scientific here and clear away the humbug that has gathered about science. Science is something that men do: it isn't a natural force floating in the air. It is a human activity. It is also the beliefs that we accept about the world we live in as a result of the investigations of the scientists. Now we can't all be scientists. We can't all devote our lives to the discovery of scientific truth. If

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

we did, who would build our laboratories, and manufacture our instruments, and who would cook our dinner? So to put our faith in science means to put our faith in scientists. Now I don't think anybody really proposes to do that. If you do, you must be labouring under a misapprehension. Why do you talk of putting your faith in science? Is it not because science has enabled us to do a great many wonderful things like broadcasting? I must point out, in that case, that it is not science that you are trusting to, but invention—the application of science to practical life. It is the inventor rather than the scientist that you are trusting. You will agree, I think. Then I must ask you a question. Which applications of science do you put your faith in? In machine-guns, bombing planes, poison gases, speed boats, or which? In the invention of cures for disease, of cheap and comfortable houses, of machines which will eliminate human toil, the first result of which is unemployment? There's the rub. Science can be applied for good or for evil purposes, for destruction or for construction, to minister to human greed and selfishness or to human love and sympathy. I imagine that when you talk of putting your faith in science you mean that you trust that men will apply the knowledge that the scientists gain to valuable, constructive activities and refrain from using it for small, selfish, mean ends. But now notice that it is not science you are believing in, but the fundamental goodness of human nature, that love is stronger than hate, that unselfishness will con-

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

quer greed, that brotherliness will triumph over envy and antagonism. Is that a scientific belief? What has the science of history or sociology or psychology to say to it? It isn't a scientific belief, and science has nothing to say to it, except that, so far as the facts go, it is a very poorly grounded one.

You see the point. You cannot put your trust in science, for a very simple reason. Science is concerned with facts and with the laws that govern facts. It is completely unbiased, unemotional, disinterested. It has no purpose except to understand facts. What you do with knowledge that science creates is not the business of science. Science has nothing to do with good or evil, with the satisfaction of human desires. It has nothing to do with action; because it must be completely disinterested, and action cannot be disinterested. Action depends on what you want, on your choice of what is most worth doing. Science says, as it were: 'If you want to do this, I know how it can be done, or I can find out for you how to do it.' But it can't tell you what is worth doing. That is not its province. And so you have to decide for science what is worth doing before you can use science to do it. In my last talk, you will remember, I pointed out that a faith was a principle of valuation by means of which a man decides what is worth while and what is not. The conclusion follows, inevitably. Science cannot provide a faith for the modern world. It can only provide the means for achieving what we want to achieve. If what we want

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

is evil or stupid or selfish, science will prove disastrous. If our wants are wise and high-minded, it will be a boon. Science itself is indifferent. It cannot help us to decide what is worth while or whether life is worth living. It can only serve our wishes. Note that point carefully. Science is knowledge, and knowledge is power; and power is the servant of the man who has it. Science therefore is necessarily a servant; it cannot be a master. What determines life for us is the use to which we put science. And what is it that determines the use to which we put it? To that there is only one answer. We shall use science to get what we want and to do what we think most worth doing. And if we begin to feel that nothing is really worth doing, we shall not use science at all, or use it only to amuse ourselves and to distract our minds from the deadly boredom of living a life that has lost its meaning because we have lost our faith.

So the dilemma returns upon us. Science is useless to us unless we have a faith that can use it. But science has been fighting our faith and looks like destroying it. The faith of Europe, by which it has lived and achieved, is Christianity. It is Christianity which has unified and directed our emotional life, determined our nobler purposes, created our societies. Also—mark this well—it was Christianity which gave us science by its insistence on the spirit of truth. It is still the Christian impulse that sustains all that is really fine and inspiring in our modern life, including science. And if the growth of science is going to destroy our

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

faith, then indeed science is going to commit suicide by sawing off the branch on which it sits. If, under the delusion produced by our misunderstanding of science, we jettisoned our religion, who or what is going to furnish us with a new faith to take its place? Science cannot, as we have seen. It can serve a faith, but it cannot provide one. For science is intellectual, and a faith is a matter of the emotional life. It is what we feel, not what we think, that ultimately determines the course of life.

This truth leads us to recognize that science itself rests upon a faith and is impossible without it. In other words, science, however disinterested and unemotional it may be in itself, rests upon an emotional basis like any other human activity. Science is sustained by the love of the truth. Apart from a passionate belief in the supreme value of truth, and from the willingness to sacrifice pleasant illusions to that faith in the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, science could neither begin nor continue. Let there be light, even if it only reveals chaos and cruelty and ugliness—that is the first commandment of science. It is also, we should remember, the first commandment of Christianity. ‘This is the condemnation’, wrote John, ‘that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil.’ Our dilemma begins to wear a new face: it begins to show itself as a dilemma in our emotional life. For, as we saw, it is the *spirit* of science and the *spirit* of religion which are in conflict within

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

us—both of them emotional attitudes. And a perplexing question arises for us. How can the spirit of science, which is a passionate faith in truth, be in conflict with the spirit of Christianity? How is it possible to accept Christianity and reject the spirit of truth which is the basis of science?

Let me conclude this talk by summing up what I have had to say to-night. We are in a very real dilemma about our science and our religion, and the dilemma exists for each of us in our own consciousness. We feel that science and all that science implies is essential to us, that it is a good thing, that it is the great achievement of our modern world. We feel, equally, that our religion is essential to us, and even if we are not so keenly aware of that as we are of science it is only because our religion is more deeply in us and more unconsciously part of our very selves. It determines our attitude to life, and for the most part we take it for granted. But these two elements of our modern consciousness are tugging in different directions, and the stress has become so great that it is destroying our capacity for action. For the more science possesses our minds, the more it seems to necessitate a kind of action which seems to oppose and sometimes to shock and to outrage our traditional ways of acting, which are rooted in our religious feelings. So our heads and hearts are in conflict within us.

That is the first point, and it presented itself as a choice between science and Christianity. But when

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

we looked deeper into it we found that it was not so simple. Because science itself is not a faith, and cannot furnish a faith that could take the place of Christianity. Instead, science itself rests upon a faith, and demands a faith to sustain it and to use it. The faith in truth at all costs and in living by the light of the truth we have, is the basis of science and of its application to life. And that faith was brought into the world by Christianity, and is still sustained by Christianity. Science then is rooted in Christianity and stands or falls with it. So that if we throw Christianity overboard in order to choose science, we shall destroy the basis of science in doing so. It is therefore impossible to choose between science and religion since our faith in science is itself a religious faith. And let us not forget that this does not solve the dilemma: it merely states it and deepens it. It does not touch the fact, which *is* a fact, that our feeling for science and our feeling for religion are at loggerheads and that their opposition is destroying us and our civilization.

What, then, does it reveal? Mainly, I think, that the dilemma is in our emotional life, and not really in our intellectual life or even in any opposition between our intellect and our emotions. It is reflected in our minds, of course; but it has not its source there. It is our emotional attitude to life that is divided against itself.

I would suggest, for your further consideration, that there are two reasons for this. First, that in spite of our boasting, we do not really believe in science ex-

SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION?

cept in so far as it ministers to our unscientific wants. That is usually called cupboard love. In other words, our desire to know the truth and to live by the truth, without bias or prejudice in our own favour, is still very weak and limited. To be scientific, if it means anything, means to be unprejudiced in our judgments. My second suggestion is that we do not really believe in Christianity, and mainly because our modern religion is not, in fact, Christian. If it were, it could not be in conflict with the spirit of science, which is itself the expression as well as the creation of essential Christianity.

THE MODERN DILEMMA

III

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

QUITE A number of friends and correspondents have objected to the way in which—as it seems to them—I have made light of the economic crisis which is upon us. They feel that what we need is an economic solution of an economic problem, and they would like me to deal with that side of the dilemma. So I must reinforce my position. I am sure that the economic problem is a serious one; indeed, it seems to me to be much more serious and deep-seated than most of the economists seem to realize, and the economic adjustments which will be necessary if it is to be satisfactorily and permanently solved will be much more far-reaching than most people seem to think. Yet I am convinced that the economic dilemma, for all its magnitude, is only a symptom of a more deep-seated disease; that it is a reflection in the external, material body of our life, of a trouble that has its seat deep in our spiritual life; and, like a good doctor, I feel that there is no use trying to cure the symptoms. Even the economists keep telling us that the crisis is a crisis of confidence. I have said that it is a

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

crisis of faith. And faith is another name for confidence. You can't expect people to retain their confidence in money when they have lost their confidence in men. We can't lose our faith in life, in the world, in ourselves, in our fellows, without losing our faith in the machinery of life with it.

I have listened to talks about science on the wireless by various eminent speakers during the last fortnight, and I have been struck by the unanimity with which they have emphasized one point that I made in my last talk. Science, they have said, can be used for good purposes or bad purposes; and therefore, the future of our civilization depends on how science is used—not on science itself. It will depend on the attitude to life which is in control of the power which science gives us. That, I think, is obviously true. But I am amazed beyond measure that they stop there. Everybody seems to stop there. I am left with the impression that they think that the way in which science will be used depends upon chance; that the emotional attitudes which determine what purposes we or our rulers set out to achieve through science, are quite outside control; that fate or history, or some other mythical goddess in the modern pantheon of superstition will decide for us. Now it is precisely that feeling, that we cannot decide what is worth while achieving, that I put my finger upon as the heart of the modern dilemma. It is precisely this that I described as our loss of faith. If we had a faith, *we* should determine the uses to which science should be

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

put, and we should see that they were put to these uses and to no others. Let me add one word here. If we continue in this state, if we leave the decision of what is worth while as a use for science to chance, then inevitably chance will decide against us. There are laws of the world of value. The civilization which leaves the decision of its values to chance has failed; and history, like Nature, sweeps its failures on to the dust-heap and starts over again. If we do not deliberately decide what we shall do with our science, science, like Samson, will bring down our house upon us and destroy itself, with us, in general ruin. There are spiritual laws which are quite as inexorable as natural laws.

The tradition of our civilization is heavily biased in favour of the intellect against the emotions. We think that it is wise to trust our minds, and foolish to trust our feelings. We consider that it is the human intellect that raises man above the level of the animal creation, while the emotional movements in us are what gives us kinship with the animals. We behave in terms of that bias. Faced with a problem, we invariably turn to the intellect to solve it for us. If we find that what we have done has landed us in difficulties, we immediately assume that we must have miscalculated, that we didn't think the thing over with sufficient care. In many cases, and these the most important, the mistake lies not in our thinking but in our feeling. It is not our thinking that was false, but our emotion. As a result we admire and rely

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

upon all those expressions of human life which are intellectual—science, law, power, duty, machinery and so on, and we spend much time and labour on the task of developing our intellects and training our capacity to think; while we hardly ever think it necessary, or even possible, to train our capacity for feeling.

This bias in favour of the intellect has a long history behind it. Its roots lie in that very ancient doctrine that teaches the evil of desire and the necessity for subduing desire. It is only another expression of the same doctrine that looks upon the body as itself evil, as the prison-house of the pure spirit which is corrupted and infected by its contact with matter. We have softened down the crudeness of the expression of this view in modern times, but it is still true, I think, that it governs us to a much greater degree than we imagine. It still determines our emotional attitudes, even while we repudiate it in our thoughts. We still *feel* that there is something ignoble about the body, just because it is the body, and that a bodily desire is disreputable somehow, just because it is bodily. The citadel of this ancient organization of feeling against the body is, of course, our attitude to sex. In that field our lives are dominated by feelings which are quite irrational, which refuse to combine with our intellectual convictions and with the spirit which we approve in other fields. With the result that we are nearly all obsessed by sex, and unable to solve the practical dilemma that it sets us throughout a large part of our lives.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

I mention this point for two reasons. First, because I think that it is one of the main storm-centres of our emotional dilemma, and one which we shall have to face up to more courageously than we are doing. Secondly, because somehow or other the old persistent distrust of the body and therefore of the feelings which centre round sex has got mixed up with the Christian tradition, and many good people think that in defending that old attitude to the body they are defending Christianity against the growing laxity in morals. Nothing could be further from the truth. The growing freedom in the relations between men and women, which is changing our attitude towards the questions of sex and marriage and the family and is tending to upset the traditional balance of our emotional life in so many ways is quite obviously the result of the emancipation of woman and of the demand for equality of the sexes in all fields. That, in its turn, is the latest triumph of Christianity upon us, with science as its handmaid. Let me remind you that when St. Paul issued the declaration: 'There is neither bond nor free', and so declared war at the start, in the name of Christianity, upon slavery, he also announced in the same breath that 'there is neither male nor female'.

It is amazing how these ancient complexes of emotion persist in us long after they have ceased to have any rational meaning for us, and how helpless our reason is in face of them. It is a commonplace that you cannot argue any man into a real belief if his feelings are set against it. I want you to consider the

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

consequences of this with me for a little, for it is the heart of the modern dilemma. A merely intellectual force is powerless against an emotional resistance. If, for instance, an economist were to devise the perfect plan for the settlement of our industrial troubles, and prove beyond controversy that it was the only way to solve our problem, it would still be of no avail if our emotions were ranged against it. We could not put it into operation. Unless the emotions and the intellect are in harmony, rational action will be paralysed.

Now that, I think, is our actual situation. And it will clear up the issue if at this point I state as clearly as I can what I think the modern dilemma is. In the modern period, that is to say since the break-up of the mediæval world, there has been an immense development of knowledge. There has, however, been no corresponding emotional development. As a result we are intellectually civilized and emotionally primitive; and we have reached the point at which the development of knowledge threatens to destroy us. Knowledge is power, but emotion is the master of our values and of the uses, therefore, to which we put our power. Emotionally we are primitive, childish, undeveloped. Therefore, we have the tastes, the appetites, the interests and the apprehensions of children. But we have in our hands a vast set of powers, which are the products of our intellectual development. We have used these powers to construct an intricate machinery of life, all in the service of our childish desires. And now we are waking up to the

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

fact that we cannot control it; that we do not even know what we want to do with it. So we are beginning to be afraid of the work of our hands. That is the modern dilemma.

How has it arisen? The answer is, I think, that we have set the intellect free and kept emotion in chains. That is a summary of the inner history of the modern world. The driving force below the development of Europe has always been the struggle for freedom, and the clue to that struggle lies in Christianity. Freedom, of course, means responsibility. To live freely is to be responsible for one's own life; and everything in us that seeks to shirk that responsibility fights against freedom. During the Middle Ages the desire to escape responsibility was too strong for the growing desire for freedom, and so both the intellectual and the emotional life remained in bondage to external authority. The ends of life and the means of achieving these ends were both imposed upon men; what was to be desired and what was to be thought were both determined for men; and the demand for freedom of life, which Christianity had implanted and which was growing in secret and seeking to be born, was drugged by promises of satisfaction in another world, and so diverted from the effort to realize freedom in this world.

This suppression of the Christian impulse broke down at the Renaissance, and its breakdown destroyed Mediæval civilization and tore Europe into the fragments which have become the independent

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

nation-states of to-day. The struggle for the achievement of freedom began. It has been gradually more and more successful, but only in the intellectual field. It has given us science, which is simply the result of free thought. As we have seen, thought is always, in its bearings on life, instrumental. Truth is always a means to good living. So that freedom to think means in practice freedom in dealing with the machinery of life, freedom in organizing the means of life, that is to say, freedom on the material side, economic and political freedom. But while achieving freedom to think, and so to determine and control the machinery of life, we have not achieved freedom to feel, and so to determine and control the ends of life, that is to say, the uses to which our knowledge and our organization should be put.

To understand this let us consider what is involved in setting thought free. It means, does it not, that you insist on thinking for yourself and that you allow and encourage and train other people to think for themselves. You give up saying: 'this is the truth; we know it is the truth and you must accept it.' You say rather that truth is to be discovered by patient search, in which it is everyone's duty to take his share. Now notice one thing in particular. So long as you think that you know the truth, so long as you believe that it has been revealed and is guaranteed, thinking is unnecessary, and at the best is an amusement, like solving a crossword puzzle. It is only when you recognize that you don't know, that you are ignorant, that

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

what you have hitherto believed is not certain, that there is any serious reason for thinking. It is only when you do not know what your conclusions will be that thought is free.

When the founders of science began, some centuries ago, to fight for freedom of thought, what they had to fight was the social conviction that everything worth knowing was already known. God had revealed the truth through the Scriptures and Aristotle and the Church; and it was guaranteed by the Church. They began to doubt the truth they had been taught to believe. They realized they did not know about the world and they set about trying to find out by thought and experiment what was true. They found themselves, in fact, fighting the whole system of beliefs about the world which society, through the Church, believed to be true. And the gradual success of their efforts meant the gradual destruction of the certainties on which the whole of society relied.

If that is what it meant to set thought free, what did it mean to leave emotion in bondage? It meant that we left the world of our values still controlled externally. Value is emotionally apprehended. We agreed, in setting thought free to discover truth, that we did not know what was true; but in keeping emotion bound, we refused to agree that we did not know what was good. By freeing thought we have escaped from a false certainty and gained in exchange, not certainty, but the steady growth of real knowledge.

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

By refusing to free emotion we have left ourselves in a false conviction about good and evil, about right and wrong, about what is worth while and what is not. In that all-important field we are still at the mercy of social prejudices, of traditional convictions. To set the emotions free, therefore, would mean that we began to doubt our convictions about what is good and what is not good. We should begin to say to ourselves: 'Do I really know what is worth while in life? Are the things that I have always felt to be wrong really wrong? Can I trust the scheme of values which is traditional in my society?' That would be the first thing: but in itself it would only mean the despair of scepticism. The second thing necessary would be a faith that by honest feeling honestly acted upon we should gradually discover what was really good and build it into the structure of our lives.

I know quite well what the instinctive reaction of my listeners will be in many cases. If you let people feel for themselves what is good and what is evil, and act upon their own emotions, where will it end? We know what human passions are. Our whole society would go smash. Everybody would do as they pleased, there would be an end of morality and a destruction of everything that has been so patiently built up by the labours and sacrifices of our fathers. What we need is for all who are men and women of goodwill to stand together in defence of the values which our civilization stands for, and in an effort to prevail on the others to remember their duty and

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

stand to it like men.

My friends, I understand that attitude. I also am one of you and I feel it myself. But let us be quiet. There, precisely, is our dilemma. We can only do this if the values which we have stood for are real values. And that is the rising doubt. There is a point at which the freedom of thought is incompatible with the bondage of the emotional life. And we have reached it. Up to a point it is possible to keep our thought and our feeling separate. Up to a point it is possible to keep truth and value separate. But there comes a point at which the freedom of thought turns back upon ourselves and begins to ask: 'What are the facts about your own feelings?' Are your feelings about what is good and beautiful and useful compatible with the facts of the world as we now know them? That is the point at which history has placed us. We can only maintain our dogmatic certainty of conviction by setting limits to the freedom of thought to enquire honestly into the standing of our convictions. We must either set our emotions free or destroy the freedom of thought.

That is my conclusion. We are standing, to-day, at the second crisis of our European history; the second great crisis in the fight for human freedom. The first was the crisis in which we chose, after much fear and hesitation and persecution, to trust one another to think for ourselves and to stand by the expression of our honest thought. Now we are called upon to implement that faith in the human mind by trusting in the

THE DILEMMA IN OUR EMOTIONAL LIFE

integrity of human feeling. Next week I propose to deal with the religious significance of this new demand upon our faith. But I should like to say one other thing in closing. To trust our human feelings and act upon them freely is not to do as one feels inclined, to feel anyhow and to act anyhow. The free thought that has unravelled the mysteries of the natural world is not and cannot be undisciplined thought, which is never free. Scientific thought is thought set free to discover what is true and to believe the truth that it discovers, however much it may upset existing opinions. It is disciplined by the world with which it deals, by testing its conclusions against fact. The freedom of our emotional life is to be achieved only on the same conditions; that we set out to discover, through feeling, the real values of our world and of our life in the world. We shall have to submit to the discipline of our feelings, not by authority nor by tradition, but by life itself. It will not guarantee us security or pleasure or happiness or comfort: but it will give us what is more worth having, a slow gradual realization of the goodness of the world and of living in it.

THE MODERN DILEMMA

IV

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

LAST WEEK I completed my diagnosis of the modern dilemma by tracking it down to its source in our emotional life. This afternoon, in my last talk, I should like to express to you what seems to me to be the remedy. That means an effort to express, so far as I am able—and at the best that will be feebly—the faith by which the modern world could live.

I shall begin by reminding you of what my diagnosis has been. The obvious problems which face us are industrial and economic. But these problems cannot be solved in economic terms because they are merely symptoms of a deep-lying division in the inner life of our civilization. For their solution we need a unifying faith, that is to say, a conviction about what is most worth achieving. Nothing else will enable us to decide between the various courses of common action that are open to us. Our dilemma arises from the fact that we have no common working faith.

The most obvious general symptom of this malady lies in the struggle in our minds between the claims

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

of science and the claims of religion. We cannot accept science wholeheartedly, because to do so would violate many of our most cherished religious ideas and feelings. We cannot wholeheartedly accept our religion, because we are committed to science and convinced of the truth of science by the enormous power it has put into our hands. *Prima facie*, this is a struggle between our knowledge and our feelings, between intellect and emotion, between our heads and our hearts. Shall we follow our heads or our hearts? Shall we cleave to science or to religion? Shall we follow our intellects or our emotions? But looking deeper, we saw that this is an unreal antithesis. Action is necessarily determined by feeling. We cannot follow our intellects unless our feelings will allow us. We cannot look to science to solve our dilemma because science is not a faith. It is mere knowledge; and has no bearing upon our desires. It gives us power to do what we want to do but cannot tell us what we should want. And it is what we want that decides how we act. Our dilemma lies in the fact that we cannot decide what would be best to do because we cannot decide what is best worth having. That is a dilemma, not between the heart and the head, but in the heart. What is worth while cannot be decided by thinking, by intellect, by science, but only by emotion. Life is an art, not a science. You can only have a science of the means or of the machinery of life.

Last week I tried to explain how our dilemma has arisen. We have set thought free and kept our emo-

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

tions in chains. That means that we have learned to trust ourselves to think but we have refused to trust ourselves to feel. We have learned to look facts in the face but not to look values in the face. And the point has come in the history of our civilization when that division between fact and value can continue no longer, because our science, groping intellectually after facts, has come to the point of insisting upon having the facts about our values, about our feelings and motives. For though science cannot determine our desires for us, it can tell us what they really are, and make it impossible to pretend about them any longer. Science will make it increasingly impossible for us to disguise our lust for power as a humanitarian passion for benevolence, our greed of gain as service to the community, our anxiety for our property-rights as a passion for justice, or our craving for security as religion. That is the point at which it is impossible any longer to allow freedom of thought alongside of emotional bondage. So long as we can pretend about our feelings we can face the facts about things that don't stir our feelings. But that is only so long as we can remain unconscious of what our feelings really are; so long as we can deceive ourselves unconsciously. We are still struggling hard, like a patient in the throes of psycho-analysis, to prevent the revelation to ourselves of the emotional forces which control our personal and our national activity. Concealment grows increasingly difficult. The War, and particularly the peace we made after the War, have revealed

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

something of the emotional forces of our social life to us. The economic crisis is forcing the lesson home. But the patient, groping labour of the psychologist is proving a deadlier weapon; and I am not sure that the analysis of the modern novelist is not the deadliest of all. We are beginning to know ourselves. It is a process that hurts, that disillusion; and there is no guarantee that it will cure us. Science cannot create a faith, but it can destroy a faith that rests but upon a basis of falsehood.

The roots of religion are in the emotional life. That is not to make the common mistake of saying that religion is simply a matter of feeling. It is emphatically not. It is a response of the whole of our personality to the whole of life; and it therefore includes the intellectual side of our nature, of necessity. If we are to say, as in some sense we must, that science belongs to the intellect, then what belongs to the emotions, in the same sense, is not religion but art. Now, neither science nor art are in themselves practical or concrete. Religion is. And religion is practical because it unifies the intellectual and the emotional sides of our nature in a way of living. I make this point to meet some criticisms that have reached me in letters, and to guard against the commonest mistake in our current thought about religion, which would resolve it into a mere feeling reaction and identify it with mysticism. Against that it is important to urge that religion is, above all things, a way of living and neither merely a set of beliefs about the world nor a

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

set of feelings about the world—although *because* it is a way of living it includes both these.

But we have seen that the issues of life arise in the emotions, not in the intellect, and indeed that the intellect itself rests upon the emotional life. It is true of religion, therefore, that its roots are emotional. And it is in relation to the emotional dilemma that we must consider religion. Now there are two, and I think only two, emotional attitudes through which human life can be radically determined. They are love and fear. Love is the positive principle, fear the negative. Love is the principle of life, while fear is the death-principle in us. I mean that literally; and would go on to explain it by saying that you can divide men and women most fundamentally into two classes, those who are fear-determined and those who are love-determined. The former are not merely dead souls; they stand for death against life. They obstruct and fight against life wherever they find it. They are the people of whom D. H. Lawrence—who understood these things better than any other man of our time—said that they are sunless. They have no sun in themselves and they go about putting out the sun in other people. They are the people of whom Jesus said that they needed to be reborn. Whereas the love-determined people have life in them, abundant life, and they turn towards life and fight for life against the forces of death. They are the people who are really alive, of whom it can be said that they possess eternal life as a well within them perpetually spring-

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

ing. They are the people who are emotionally free.

I want you to consider carefully the principle of fear and its effects, because it is central in the religious problem. Notice first that fear is the great emotional force which inhibits action. Life is, in its nature, spontaneous activity. To be alive is to express, in an unembarrassed commerce with the world outside us, the life that is in us in action. Fear freezes the spontaneity of life. The more fear there is in us, the less alive we are. Fear accomplishes this destruction of life by turning us in upon ourselves and so isolating us from the world outside us. That sense of individual isolation which is so common in the modern world, which is often called 'individualism', is one of the inevitable expressions of fear. I should like to call it 'egocentricity'. Selfishness and self-consciousness are expressions of the same thing. A life which is fear-determined is a life which is fundamentally on the defensive. It is permeated by the feeling of being alone in a hostile world. With the result that all its energies are directed towards building up a defence—what the psychologists nowadays call a system of defence-mechanisms—against the world. In this condition our heart's demand is for security, for protection, for some kind of salvation from the hostility of the world.

Now most of us, and therefore our societies in general, are fear-determined in this way. There are a few great periods in our history, like the Elizabethan Age, for example, when the fear-principle seems to have been temporarily relaxed, and when the spon-

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

taneity of life reasserted itself. Then men and women did great things and lived naturally and creatively. It is worth while noting that it is only rarely in individuals and more rarely in societies that human life exhibits itself in its proper nature, when it is not mastered and inhibited by fear. Average human life is not normal. For the viciousness of fear is that it sets our life against itself. When we concentrate on defending ourselves against the world outside us, against nature and other nations and other people, we are frustrating ourselves; and the more successful we are in achieving security, the more completely do we frustrate ourselves. For what are we afraid of? What are we defending ourselves against? Against life—against our own life, the life that is us. There is only one secure defence against life, and that is death. The person who lives on the defensive is really seeking death, seeking to escape from life. And most of us succeed only too well, and wake up late in life to discover that we have never really lived at all.

The effort to defend oneself against life is inevitably self-defeating in the long run. For the defences we build round our precious selves only serve to isolate us from all that we really want. There is no fear more potent than the fear of fear, which is the fear of isolation. The more we defend ourselves against life the more we feel isolated from life and the more deadly becomes our fear. We are in a vicious circle; for this fear of isolation only drives us to strengthen our defence-mechanism, and so to isolate us still more.

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

Now, there is one kind of defence which I must draw your attention to, because of its importance and its peculiar deadliness. It is the provision of what the psychologists call escape-mechanisms, but which is more simply called pretence or make-believe. We resort to imaginary activities and pretend they are real ones. For example, we pretend that we are enjoying life by working ourselves into a state of excitement. We slap one another on the back and call one another by our Christian names to pretend that we are really in touch with one another, and to cheat the feeling of emptiness and isolation that gnaws at our vitals. And the sociability, the energy and activity that we create in this way is spurious. It commits us to unreality. It is the expression of our fear of being alone, not of our love of being together. It is the activity of death, not of life, and to anyone who has eyes to see it gives itself away by its mechanical nature. Every real expression of life is an expression of positive spontaneity and works from within outwards. If we are really alive we are love-determined and live outwards into the world. But every real expression of life has its counterfeit, its imitation, which is based on fear; and fear is the disease, the one root-disease of human life.

This brings me to what I want to say about religion. All religion is an effort to create a normal, a complete human life, to achieve an integration of personality within itself and with the world in which it lives. For this reason it is concerned, primarily, with

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

the conquest of fear. Explicitly or implicitly any religion says to men and women: 'Fear not, only believe.' But—and this is the heart of the matter—the release from fear offered by religion may be based on fear; it may be a pretence or a counterfeit. And that kind of religion is false religion, sham religion, expressing the refusal of life, not its acceptance.

It is an old doctrine that religion is the creation of fear. It has been revived in our time in a scientific dress by the psychologists. Religion, they say, is a comforting illusion, an escape-mechanism. It helps us to *imagine* that the world is not hostile; it promises us help and comfort and recompense for what we suffer. Others will say that religion is a dope. It drugs our sense of the evil and suffering of our lives with illusions—of free-will, immortality, happiness and so forth, and so makes us resigned to the evils which are our natural portion. What are we to say of this? The honest answer seems to me to be that it is true of nearly all the religion that the world has known. It is true of all pseudo-religion. It is not true of real religion. With regard to the Freudian doctrine that religion, as such, is an imaginary wish-fulfilment, it is necessary to point out that the same considerations which lead to this view of religion would lead to the same view of science and therefore of Freudian psychology. With that controversy, therefore, we need not worry ourselves. What is important is to distinguish between real and unreal religion.

All religion, I have said, is grappling with fear.

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

When it is successful it convinces its adherents that there is nothing to be afraid of. Notice now that this may mean two quite different things. It may mean, in the first place, that none of the things you are afraid of will happen to you; that you will be saved from suffering and loss and unhappiness and death. That is the principle on which false religion is based. It is often called optimism. But it is not the only meaning that the doctrine can have. To say that there is nothing to be afraid of may mean that all the things that we are afraid of will happen or may happen to us, and that there is no reason to fear them even if they do. That is what real religion says. To the man who is afraid of poverty, it does not say: 'God will save you from losing your money.' It says: 'Suppose you do lose your money, what is there to be afraid of in that?' If it is the fear of suffering and death that haunts you, real religion says 'Yes, of course, you will suffer and, of course, you will die, but there is nothing to be afraid of in that.' It does not say, as all false religion and false idealism does in effect: 'Shut your eyes to things you are afraid of; pretend that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds; and there are ways and means of getting the divine powers on your side, so that you will be protected from the things you are afraid of. They may happen to other people, but God will see to it that they don't happen to you.' On the contrary, true religion says 'Look the facts you are afraid of in the face; see them in all their brutality and ugliness; and you will find, not

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

that they are unreal, but that they are not to be feared.' If you ask me now, where is there a religion which has ever taken that line, which has refused to offer its adherents an escape from the reality of evil and suffering, the answer is 'The religion of Christ'. May I remind you of two sayings of his: 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and say all manner of things falsely against you for my sake.' And another: 'In the world ye shall have tribulations, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.'

I hope I have made this point clear, for it is my solution of the modern dilemma. The solution of our dilemma is to be found, I am convinced, in Christianity and only there. But—it is *not* to be found in pseudo-Christianity. Let me put the issue from another angle. Real religion will save us from our fear but not from the things we are afraid of. So that any religion, any form of Christianity which offers us protection from life, defence against the consequences of our ignorance and folly and escape from the natural demands of the conditions of our human existence is spurious. To demand security is the expression of fear, and the religion that offers us security is a false religion, a religion fear-determined and death-determined. And such a religion is the greatest destructive force known to human life. Religion, like art and science, and in a more certain and commanding sense than either, cannot be prostituted to the service of ulterior motives without being defiled.

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

You cannot use Christianity to bolster up an unjust order of society, or to save you from the perils of truth and justice and integrity.

In closing, then, we must come back to the immediate problem of our civilization. Why can we not act greatly for the solution of our international economic problems? Why do we simply watch our social system going to pieces before our eyes? Why are we paralysed? Because we are afraid, afraid of one another, afraid of ourselves, afraid of the consequences of any decisive action. We are fear-determined, and our one demand is the fear-demand, the demand for security, for protection. Our dilemma lies in the fact that the more we try to defend ourselves the more we destroy ourselves by isolating ourselves more and more from one another. You have noticed, have you not, that our efforts to solve a confessedly international problem only seem to increase nationalism? That is because it is fear that is the motive force of our efforts to solve the problem. There is only one way in which we can escape from the dilemma, and that is by destroying the fear that is at the root of it. And I know of no force in the world which is capable of doing that except Christianity.

Some of you will ask, I think, 'Do you really mean that Christianity can save us? Are you telling us that we must go back to the old faith that has failed us?' My answer is, decidedly, 'No'. I do not think that Christianity will save us from the things we are afraid

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of. I think it would save us from the fear of them which paralyses us. An outbreak of Christianity would be more likely to make short work with the makeshift society we have got. It seems to me that modern religion is mostly pseudo-Christianity; and my main reason for thinking so is that it is everywhere regarded, by its friends as well as by its enemies, as a bulwark of the present social system, as a social defence-mechanism, as a stand-by in our fear-struggle to uphold a tradition, in a word, as one of the expressions of our fear of life. Europe has never been Christian, least of all in the so-called Age of Faith. I see the history of our civilization as a struggle against Christianity which has been successful in the main ; or, if you will, as an effort to turn the one real religion, the religion of love and of abundant life, into a fear-religion which would minister to our desire to be secured against the forces of life. In science, I repeat, Christianity has won a partial triumph, a triumph over our thought, and has set it free. But that triumph is nugatory until it makes the conquest of our emotional life and sets that free. Real Christianity stands to-day, as it has always stood, for life against death, for spontaneity against formalism, for the spirit of adventure against the spirit of security, for faith against fear, for the living colourful multiplicity of difference against the monotony of the mechanical, whether it be the mechanization of the mind, which is dogmatism, or the mechanization of the emotions, which is conformity.

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

In conclusion, as I know from letters, I must face the question: 'What are we to do about it? Have you nothing to offer us but this highly analytical, highly intellectual statement of the modern dilemma? You have said that our feelings are bound and we must set them free—but how? You have said that we have lost our faith and must recover it or create a new one. But how does one begin to grow faith? How does one set about developing freedom of feeling, and rid oneself of fear?'

I must confess that if there is an answer to that question, I do not know it. I do not think there is one, unless it is a negative one. For, after all, if I am on the track of the truth at all, then you and I are the modern dilemma. It is in you and me that the division between thought and feeling rules. It is you and I who are afraid, and the fear and the dilemma are at the heart of our being. Whatever we do will be wrong till we are put right. If we start trying to set our feelings free we will just be making the dilemma worse; because we shall use our intellects to force ourselves to feel and to act from feeling, and the whole action will be a sham. It would only express what we think we feel, or what we think we ought to feel; and our last state would be worst than the first. We should turn our fear of feeling into a fear of not feeling, our fear of spontaneity into a fear of not being spontaneous. Reverse your fear, change its object, and it is still fear. We are in a vicious circle. Until we are healed we cannot act healthily. The springs of true

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

action are dried up in you and me, and everything we do will be false.

Then, must we just give up hope and relapse into despair? I do not think so. Indeed, our despair would itself be false. What we have to do is to wait and be quiet; to stop our feverish efforts to do something; to cease our fruitless attempt to save ourselves. Salvation, if it comes to us, must come from outside. We must wait for the new thing to be born in us; for the new light to be manifested to us. Even to look is useless, for our eyes are blinded. We can only be quiet and wait, expectant but unworried, for the creative word that will say 'Let there be light.' There is nothing else to be done. The next word is not with *us*, but with reality.

I should like to go further and say that I am sure that our salvation will come from Christianity. But there, too, I am in a dilemma. Our religion is as much divided at heart as we are, and has lost its roots. It needs salvation and transformation as much as we do. It has become itself a religion of fear and of escape and denied its own nature, and so it has lost meaning for us. But its meaning is still there. Its founder was one, whatever our theories about him may be—and like all theories, they are of quite secondary importance—who saw more clearly and deeply into the human dilemma, whether ancient or modern, than any other man of whom we have a record. And we have some of his sayings. It might be worth our while to listen to them while we are waiting. In what I have

A FAITH FOR THE MODERN WORLD

tried to say, I have been largely echoing, faintly and with the strong intellectual bias under which our spirits labour, some of the penetrating things he said. There is one that comes to my mind now, upon which all that I have tried to say about the modern dilemma seems like a rather feeble commentary. 'He that saveth his life shall lose it.' In a panic of self-defence, at the end of the War, we tried to defend ourselves for ever against Germany, by taking away all her economic weapons of competition, and laying her under a perpetual tribute; and now we are finding that the effort to save our economic life has lost it. It is the same with the armies and navies which we have laboured to build up for our security. They are destroying us. Let us stop building defences round ourselves. It is not from other people that we need to be saved, but from our fear of other people. So I say, let us stop trying and be quiet, and wait. To those who want to reply 'but if we don't hurry and get things settled, if we do nothing we shall be lost,' I shall say 'Be quiet, be still—the world is not resting on our shoulders; if it were, heaven help it! If we are so futile and stupid, why should we be saved? And if our civilization is sham, what point is there in its preservation? Drop this stupid struggle against the reality of things; there cannot be anything *real* to be afraid of.' For we all know by this time that what we want is a new and better social order, which will be built and enjoyed by better men and women than we are; and obviously, if we are to have a new world

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

we must let the old one go. Even if it is like death to turn our backs upon it, to stand still and see all our defences crumble and our security vanish like smoke, I have no doubt that we shall find the last part of that saying as true as the first part is obviously true—that 'he that loseth his life shall keep it.' It is possible for men and for societies of men to be reborn, even if it is impossible to have them reconstructed.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

INTRODUCTORY PAMPHLET

THE ESSAY contained in this pamphlet has been designed as an introduction to the series of wireless talks on 'Reality and Freedom'. It is an attempt, not to summarize the substance of these talks, but to sketch the background which is their proper setting and in which they will become intelligible. Philosophy, as written by philosophers for philosophers, is apt to be very abstruse and remote. But if the philosophy is really alive, its difficulty is more apparent than real. For it arises from the need for exactness of thinking and of proof, and from the fact that between philosophers the long tradition of philosophical discussion can be taken for granted and summed up in a few technical terms. The substance of a living philosophy can always be stated and applied to ordinary experience in simple language, if one is not concerned to defend it in detail against its rivals and to demonstrate its truth point by point in the terms of set logic.

Yet even the effort to express the significance of a philosophical doctrine in simple terms demands that the speaker and his listeners should start from some

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

common ground, if they are to understand one another. Listeners must realize what the philosopher takes for granted, both in his philosophical standpoint and in his appreciation of the concrete issues of modern life.

It is to establish, if possible, such a common ground of mutual understanding that this pamphlet has been written. It represents, therefore, a personal point of view and must not be regarded as an exposition with which other philosophers would agree. It is sufficient if it enables us to understand one another.

LIVING AND DEAD PHILOSOPHY

When philosophy is alive it grows straight out of human life. However high in the air its branches may stretch themselves, its roots are deep in the soil of common human experience. If it is cut off from its roots, it becomes a dead tree which merely cumbers the ground and blocks the pathway. There is always plenty of dead philosophy about, just as there is plenty of dead art and dead religion. Academic philosophy, like academic art, is nearly always dead. It consists either of a scholarly acquaintance with the philosophy of other people or of argument about traditional problems for the sake of argument, full of very acute and learned subtlety of thought. It has great value, no doubt, as an intellectual exercise, and in the decoration of the temple of culture. But it has no vital significance whatever. A living philosophy is creative; it is something drawn from the heart of living

REALITY AND FREEDOM

experience and something that we can live by.

For this reason, a living philosophy is always contemporary. Its roots are in the life of its own time, and its problems are the living problems of the world in which it is born. It is true that the essential things in human life do not change very much from age to age, and that the questions which philosophers try to answer are universal questions which every man has put to himself from the dawn of history. That is why some of the great philosophers of the past still have a living significance for us. But the eternal questions wear a different face in different generations. The broadening of experience, the increasing achievement of civilization gives them an ever deepening significance, and at the same time increases the store of material from which we may hope to construct an answer that will be adequate to our need. However significant an old philosophy may be, it can never be adequate to the demands of the present. Its spirit may still be alive, but the body of ideas and words in which it expressed itself grows old and weak and ineffective. Words and ideas must continually be recreated, or they soon cease to express the significance that lies behind them, and conceal and destroy it instead.

In our own day the whole of European life has been profoundly modified by the Great War. The spirit and temper and outlook of our experience is radically changed. To meet that change we need a great alteration in our modes of life. We have outgrown the institutions of our civilization; they feel like ill-fitting

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

clothes. Our social forms, our political organizations, our religion, our economic devices are all too small for us. They cramp our freedom and make us inwardly a little ashamed of ourselves. We have to make new ones before we can be at ease. In these conditions we badly need a new philosophy to define some significant thought, in terms of our own peculiar difficulties, which could serve to unify and direct our efforts at reconstruction.

THE ROOTS OF OUR CULTURE

However extensive and deep-rooted the differences of our time may be, they are still differences that have developed within a society which has a long history behind it. The new need arises from the inadequacy of the old answers. The new construction of social life which we are fumbling after is the reconstruction of a tradition which is built into the texture of our very minds. We cannot cut ourselves adrift from the past; indeed we can only understand our present difficulties by understanding the past and why its constructions have failed. The new thought—the new philosophy—that we need will itself be the reconstruction of an old thought, and will only be possible through the understanding of the old. The best preparation, then, for achieving a new philosophy to meet our new needs is to trace the development of the old thoughts which satisfied the needs of our forefathers, and to discover why they have ceased to satisfy us.

Three old civilizations have been mixed together to

REALITY AND FREEDOM

form the culture of which we are the heirs—the Hebrew, the Greek and the Roman, a religious, an artistic and an organizing, administrative or scientific civilization. These three streams of old experience have never really fused. Indeed the main problem of European civilization hitherto has arisen from the strain that their antagonisms have set up, and from the effort, never successful, to unite them in a single culture.

The dominant influence in our civilization has been the influence of the Roman Empire. The Romans were deficient on the artistic and on the religious side. They adopted the Greek culture, and then the Christian religion, when they found that mere organization and administrative efficiency could not serve to maintain the unity of the Empire. But they accepted them as tributaries and servants of imperialism, while despising profoundly both Greeks and Christians. Greek art they found useful to adorn the leisure of the educated classes, and Christianity as 'dope' for the masses, to distract them from thoughts of revolution. To this day our culture has remained in that Roman mould. It is essentially imperialist, that is to say, its governing ideal is the maintenance and perfecting of an efficient organization of social life, depending on law, industrial management and the maintenance of power for the defence of law and property. Art and religion have been harnessed to the service of this ideal of administrative and organizing efficiency and subordinated to it. We are proud

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of Shakespeare and our artistic achievements—especially when they are a century or more in the past—but we look upon the artist and his artistic temperament as queer and disorderly and a little contemptible. We are annoyed with anyone who dares to deny that we are Christians, but at the same time we are inclined to look upon the pious saint as a nuisance and a mollicoddle. Such is the immense power of persistence of the tradition of the Roman Empire! We are Romans at heart, even in our extremes of Fascism and Communism, though like the Romans we are willing to use art and religion so long as they agree to play the part of menials to our ideal of social efficiency.

OUR ROMAN MORALITY

The most important aspect of this dominance of the Roman element in our culture is to be found in our moral tradition. Our traditional morality is a morality of organization. It consists in obedience to moral laws which have a social reference. It is a morality of will. Let me explain this.

Law is a fixed framework of rules for the organization of life—social or individual life. It is a fixed plan of activity, a policy of action. A man of strong will is a man who can lay down a plan of action for himself and stick to it. This capacity to act according to a fixed policy was the main characteristic of the Romans. It made them great organizers, great lawyers, great men of affairs. A typical Roman such as Julius

REALITY AND FREEDOM

Cæsar astonishes us by his alternations of cold savagery and extraordinary clemency and toleration, until we come to see that his actions are neither the outcome of a mild nor of a brutal nature, but of a rational calculation. They are acts of policy. The prime necessity, if one is to live in this calculating fashion, is a capacity to subordinate one's emotional nature to reason. If we cannot control our emotions then we can never be sure of carrying out our policy, of doing not what we want to do at the moment, but what we had decided to do. That capacity to control our feelings by our reason we call *will*. Will is the capacity to act according to plan, whether at the moment we want to do so or not. The plan may of course be one which we have decided on for ourselves, or it may be one which has been dictated to us by a higher authority—by the State for instance. In the latter case we call it a law, and say that it is our duty to obey the law, whether we want to or not.

It is clear that this notion of acting from policy (or on principle, as we sometimes put it) whatever our feelings at the moment may be, depends upon distinguishing between our feelings and our reason, and that it will tend to set up a strain between the two. The plan that we have made or which have been imposed upon us will often involve us in acting against our feelings, in refusing to do what we want to do, and following the plan instead. This strain between the reason and the feelings is often referred to as the moral struggle.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

Now if this capacity to act rationally, according to plan, is made an ideal of conduct, as it was by the Romans, then we get a morality which consists in obeying a moral law. Moral conduct, on this basis, will be conduct which adheres consistently to the moral plan and successfully resists all our inclinations to do otherwise. The good man will be the man who always does what he ought to do, not what he wants to do. He will be the man who acts rationally, not emotionally. Desire and emotion and impulse will be the great enemies of such a morality, since it is their interference that makes it difficult for us to act according to plan. Of course the moral plan must be a universal one, just because it is one which all men ought to accept. We shall have to think of it as God's plan for the world, either interpreted by some human authority to us, such as the Church or the Bible, or else revealed directly to us in our own hearts by our conscience, or else discovered by examining the nature of the world we live in. At any rate, however we discover it, it will have to be looked upon as the true plan of human life in the world, to which all men ought to conform and to which they must subdue their inclinations whenever these are in any sort of opposition to it.

This, then, is the moral side of the Roman tradition—the morality of duty, of policy and plan, of principle or moral law, of doing what you ought to do and not what you want to do. No one, I imagine, will deny that it is the dominant element in our European

REALITY AND FREEDOM

moral tradition. The important thing to notice, however, is that it is Roman, and not either Greek or Christian, in spite of the fact that it is what we mean, on the whole, when we talk of Christian morality. To make this clear we must look a little further into its history.

STOICISM

The philosophers who worked this idea out into a system of ethics were the Stoics. The part that Stoicism has played in the creation of European civilization can hardly be overestimated. The Romans were Stoics by nature, and they took to Stoicism as ducks take to the water. The Stoic philosophy became almost the official philosophy of the Roman Empire, taking the place of religion for the cultured classes. In particular it provided the moral basis for the ruling classes of Rome and the intellectual framework for the elaboration and codification of Roman law. Nearly all the great Roman jurists were Stoics.

But the founders of Stoicism were not Romans. Neither were they Greeks. They were Semitic, like the Hebrews. The native country of Stoicism is Cilicia, on the south coast of Asia Minor, and the adjacent island of Cyprus. This has an importance which is not perhaps obvious on the surface. The main city of Cilicia was Tarsus, the birthplace of the apostle Paul. The three great thinkers who created Stoicism, two Zenos and Chrysippus, were natives of Cyprus and Cilicia, and one of them was born, like

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

Paul, in Tarsus. Like Paul, they were all Hellenized Semites, people of Semitic stock who had been brought within the range of Greek culture through the conquests of Alexander the Great. Like Paul they combined the traditions and temper of the Semitic peoples with an education which had its sources in Greek thought. It was in Rome that their message found acceptance and ultimately produced such profound effects. Similarly it was to Rome that Paul eventually went and in Rome that he died. His great effort towards a philosophical theology was written as an Epistle to the Romans and shows very marked affinities with Stoic thought. And it was in the Roman Church, in the heart of a Stoic civilization, that the Pauline theology ultimately triumphed and became the official theory of a universal church which had inherited the organization of the Roman Empire.

All this is very remarkable. Its effect in general was to make European religion Roman and Stoic rather than Christian or Greek. The peculiarity of the Hebrews amongst the Semitic races lay in the prophetic element in Hebrew religion which was always in conflict with the common Semitic instinct for business organization. It was this instinct for business efficiency which made the ancient Phoenicians the great merchant traders of the world. It was the same instinct applied to religion which enabled the Hebrews to produce the elaborate and singularly efficient social system of the Jewish Law. This instinct for organizing efficiency and the worship of it as a social ideal was

REALITY AND FREEDOM

common to the Semitic peoples and the Romans, who applied it to the organization and legal administration of a great temporal empire. In the modern world the English and American peoples have done the same. But the spirituality of the Hebrews expressed itself in their long line of individual prophets, who stand out against the background of legal organization and in opposition to it. The prophetic tradition was one of inner vision and emotional response, not of the fixed plan of law and formal obedience. That prophetic tradition culminated and completed itself in Jesus, who insisted that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, that legal rationalism must be the servant of personal freedom, that life should be based upon an emotional principle, not on an intellectual one. *Thus the morality of policy and plan, of will and obedience is the antithesis of the morality preached by Christ.*

THE CLUE TO OUR HISTORY

This is the real clue to the history of Europe—to the development which has resulted in us and our world. To understand what is happening to us and to our world in the present day it is only necessary to follow that clue through the few big phases of European history since the fall of the Roman Empire. The Roman tradition has always been the dominant force. Greek and Christian traditions, subtly and essentially opposed to the dominant Roman element, have been yoked to its service and held in unwilling and restive

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

slavery. We have discovered the inner meaning of this.

The philosophy of the Roman tradition is Stoic. It insists on the distinction between reason and emotion. Its ideal makes reason dominant and emotion subservient, or even in itself the source of all evil; and therefore glorifies the rational life, the life of the will, with its emphasis on law and principle, plan and policy. For this ideal of life emotion is the real enemy, though it may be used in the service of will and reason so far as it will submit and accept the yoke.

On the other hand, the Greek and Christian elements are natural allies against the domination of the rational organizing efficiency of the Roman element. The Greek was an artistic culture, the Hebrew a religious one; and both art and religion need a spontaneity of feeling as their basis and therefore demand the subordination of reason to emotion. And emotion is the creative force in human experience, the only source of living growth, progress and development. Reason can organize what is given, order and stabilize a position which has been gained and so prepare a jumping-off ground for a new advance; but it is only emotion which can provide the impetus which drives us forward. The dominance of a rational tradition means the dominance of conservatism, of the opposition to growth and living progress. We shall not be surprised, therefore, to find that the crises of European development are times at which the Greek and Christian elements in our tradition rose in rebellion against

REALITY AND FREEDOM

the Roman dominance and for the moment gained control of the situation.

THE FIRST REVOLT OF EMOTION

The first of these crises was the one which divides the Middle Ages from what we call the modern world. It consisted of the artistic movement of the Renaissance and the religious movement of the Protestant Reformation. The first was the direct result of the rediscovery of Greek culture through the study of Greek literature. The second was the direct result of the rediscovery of original Christianity from the study of the New Testament. The mediæval world had created the European tradition out of the ruins of the Roman Empire, given it form and organization, shaped its theology and philosophy, its morality and its social life. It had used the Greek and Hebrew tradition to give an infinitely wider scope to the Roman-Stoic ideals of law and will, extending these ideas to cover the spiritual as well as the temporal side of life and to weld them into a single whole. The Middle Ages made Europe, but at the expense of subordinating its emotional spontaneity to the domination of rational rules and regulations and making it the slave of the Roman ideal of obedience to law. That suppression of emotion, of the natural creativeness of the Greek and Christian elements resulted, as emotional suppressions have a way of doing, in an explosion which destroyed the temporal and the spiritual unity of Mediævalism, set the Church against

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

the State, tore the Church into a series of fragments and the temporal power into a set of independent nation-states.

The Renaissance and the Reformation struck a severe blow at the dominance of the Roman tradition, but not a fatal blow. The Greek-Christian tradition was tamed and brought again into submission. But the subservience was never so complete, and the subsidiary outbreaks of the emotional forces were more frequent and more easily provoked. Within the fragments that were left, within the separate States and churches, the reign of law, of organization and policy, the dominance of reason was re-established. The authority of the Bible took the place of the authority of the Church, and soon came to mean the authority of the particular Church through its official interpretation of the Bible. The rather shadowy authority of the emperor became the very real sovereignty of kings and princes. Morality still remained a morality of obedience to law.

INDIVIDUALISM AND SCIENCE

Nevertheless, something had happened which had weakened once for all the tyranny of Roman rationalism. The main effect of the Renaissance and Reformation on the European tradition can be summed up in the word *individualism*. Protestantism insisted on the right of the individual to deal directly with God, to interpret the scriptures in his own way and to follow his own conscience. Politics took its stand no longer

REALITY AND FREEDOM

on the will of God as revealed through his vice-regents on earth, but on the human will of princes. Philosophy achieved the freedom of individual thinkers to think out their systems in the light of their own reason without subscribing to a traditional system of thought. Thus, though reason remained dominant—so much so that this first period of the modern world is often known as the period of rationalism—it was a reason split up into a myriad individual fragments, each of which, while loudly proclaiming its humble obedience to reason in general, proclaimed even more loudly its independence as a reason in particular. This individualism was a formal rather than a substantial result, a proclamation of independence which did little to realize independence. It raised the standard of revolt and initiated the long fight for individual freedom. It did not suffice to secure it. For people do not become free by shouting, however loudly, that they never shall be slaves, and then doing what they are told by their masters to do. The positive and essential result of the convulsion was the creation of modern science. Science is, of course, intellectual, not emotional. But in the history of the European tradition this is not the important thing about it. The significant thing is that scientific activity is free to discover the laws of the world for itself. In his thinking the scientific discoverer is not bound by laws that are made for him. The mediæval world said to the thinker: 'This is the truth, established by authority and revelation. You must think in such a way as to

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

reach these conclusions which we know to be true.' If your conclusions are laid down in advance in this fashion as a law to govern your thinking, then thought is robbed of its spontaneity and freedom, and all thinking becomes unreal, even if the set conclusions happen to be true. Scientific thought is spontaneous thought, free thought; and for this very reason it is not merely intellectual. It rests on imagination and tests itself by experiment. It becomes an exciting adventure, demanding faith and courage, risking failure and error and scepticism all the time. Science depends upon imagination, and imagination has its roots in feeling. The simple proof that science has escaped from the domination of law is that the laws which it discovers are never final or certain. The outer world may obey the scientist's laws, but these laws are themselves obedient to the scientist; and he is always altering them by guessing again.

For all this, the freedom and spontaneity of science is very limited, because it is restricted to the use of the intellect, and resolutely refuses to carry its freedom beyond the boundaries of the intellectual life. The scientists always want to subordinate all the rest of life to the laws which they themselves make through the spontaneity of their thinking. They still want us to live under law, though it is a variable law which they are free to alter and of which they are the keepers and expositors. So in its turn the scientific temper turns into a tyranny, and a tyranny which has not even the advantage of being sure of itself. Its effect

REALITY AND FREEDOM

in the moral and social field is merely to weaken the sanctions which the Roman tradition had used to support its domination.

THE SECOND REVOLT OF EMOTION

The second great eruption of the Greek and Christian elements in our tradition, the second revolt against the dominion of law and intellect occurred towards the end of the eighteenth century. We call it the Romantic Revival. Though it was notably an artistic and literary phenomenon, it had profound effects in every department of European life and thought and worked a vast revolution in our tradition. In politics it produced Rousseau and the modern democratic State. In social life it produced the educational and humanitarian movements. In philosophy it produced Hegel and modern idealism. In science it produced Darwin and evolutionary biology. In religion it produced the higher criticism and undermined the authority of the Bible. In economics it produced Karl Marx and socialism. This complete transformation of life had its roots in an outburst of emotional spontaneity. Its high priests were the Romantic poets with their pure emotional lyricism.

We must try to estimate the effect of Romanticism upon the dominant Stoic tradition of Europe. Did it succeed in dethroning the tradition of Roman will and in releasing the emotional life from its subservience to rational principles? It did not. The Roman dominance re-established itself, but precariously and only

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

through compromise. It granted the demands of emotion in theory and then proceeded to make its concessions ineffective in practice. And in doing this it introduced a pretence into the life of Europe which has poisoned it to this day. Our emotional life was set free in word, but not in fact. This is the origin of sentimentality. The second revolt of the Greek-Christian elements against the dominance of the Roman sentimentalized the moral and social life of Europe.

SENTIMENTALITY

We must content ourselves here with a few examples which will illustrate this. Sentimentality is emotion which is unreal, though it thinks it is real; which is unfree though it thinks it is free. Now we are familiar with this in a thousand forms. Indeed it is still the very texture of our social life. In politics we pretend that we govern ourselves, that democracy is 'government of the people, by the people, for the people'. In fact, of course, it is nothing of the sort, and in the nature of things it could never be. Yet the power of government to do its job of making and administering the law depends upon its capacity to make people feel that it is merely doing what they want it to do. The elaborate machinery of political campaigns is designed to arouse and maintain an emotional state of public opinion which will 'authorize' the politicians to do what they have already decided to do on quite different (and usually much sounder and saner) grounds.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

We are worked up into a state of feeling in which we are easily persuaded that what we want done is what the politicians think ought to be done, so that the acts passed by Parliament subsequently can be said to express the will of the people. This is sentimentality in politics, for which the politicians are not really to blame. For it is we who demand that the pretence shall be kept up. The effect of it is that we imagine that we are free to determine the political conditions under which we live when in fact they are determined for us by rational necessity.

The simplest and most straightforward example of this sentimentalizing of emotion is the romantic treatment of love. The romantic movement produced something like a deification of love, as we all know; and this the moral tradition of Europe accepted. But it accepted it on the tacit condition that it should remain the servant of social order and continue to work for the rational ends of organization, stability and efficiency. In religion the pretence was that love of God meant serving humanity. But if that is so, why bother about God or religion? In the social field, love of one's fellows was made to mean the service of humanitarian causes and self-sacrifice in the interest of a common good. But if what you want is to secure the triumph of a cause or the improvement of social conditions, why bother about loving people? All you have to do is to organize them and drill them into social efficiency. So in the sphere of sex love, though there was an elaborate pretence that the true basis of

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

relationship between men and women was spontaneous affection, the nineteenth century took even more elaborate pains to prevent this emotional ideal from governing conduct. The machinery of hypocrisy presided over by Mrs. Grundy was a very effective device for sentimentalizing emotion, for keeping it ineffective in practice, for directing it into the service of the ideals of social life prescribed by a rational tradition.

THE WAR—AND AFTER

In such ways did the Roman element in our tradition re-establish its dominance over the Greek and Christian elements after the outburst of the Romantic movement. But the increased difficulty of doing so can be measured by the necessity for compromise. The old tradition had to pretend, elaborately, that it was only a limited and constitutional monarchy, had to do lip-service to emotion, had to talk, not in terms of law and obedience, but in terms of love and service, of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, and of the welfare of the community. It had even to pretend that its imperialism was a 'white man's burden' undertaken from self-sacrificing motives of anxiety for the welfare of backward peoples. Yet every crisis strained the pretence and made it more difficult to conceal the real driving forces of social development that lay beneath. When we talked of welfare we really meant wealth, and it became increasingly difficult to deck out the organization of life for material ends in the

REALITY AND FREEDOM

high-sounding phrases of social idealism. The final crash came in 1914, and in 1918 came the final disillusionment. Europe went into war in a passion of idealistic sentiment, and it returned from war angry and frustrated, with its romance in tatters and its sentimentalism deflated.

What next? What is to happen to the European tradition now that the Great War has unmasked the pretence which enabled it to hold emotion in servitude during the romantic era? It is still too early to give any definite answer. Already we can see that the effort to re-establish the romantic ideal, to harness emotion once again to social and political service, is not likely to succeed. From its increasing failure we can see two tendencies rising. One is the attempt to re-establish the dominant Roman tradition in its nakedness by sheer force, or by the appeal to the need for security and prosperity of a material kind. In Italy, for example, Mussolini is perfectly well aware that he is trying to restore the old Roman tradition of Europe and to trample on the dead body of romantic democracy. There is a marked tendency amongst thinkers and writers and artists to take the same line, to appeal behind the nineteenth century to the culture of the eighteenth century or even of the mediæval world. This is quite clearly a reactionary tendency, and it is very doubtful whether it can prevail for long. Europe cannot go backward.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

THE NEW REVOLT OF EMOTION

On the other hand, there is an equally marked tendency towards a new revolt of the Greek and Christian tradition. Europe seems to be gathering her emotional forces together for a third great attack on rationalism, for another bid for real freedom, for another reassertion of art and religion against organization and efficiency. If history is any guide to prophecy we may expect that this tendency will grow and prevail; and we may expect also that this time its victory will be a final one. It will be at least another battle for freedom; and at least for the Greek and the Christian elements in our tradition freedom is the very reality of life.

In these circumstances, when the outcome is still so doubtful, and the issue indeed has not yet been joined, a living philosophy must think out again, in terms of our contemporary life, the problem of reality and freedom.

WHAT THE TALKS ARE ABOUT

It is at this point that the general argument of the talks on reality and freedom begins; and it may be of some use to listeners to know beforehand something about the course of the argument itself, so that they may realize what are the main points in each talk, and what questions each is trying to answer. I shall therefore append a slight sketch of the argument as it runs from stage to stage, and suggest a number of

REALITY AND FREEDOM

questions which listeners may think over for themselves before and after each of my talks.

The main question of the whole course can be put quite briefly in this form: 'What is reality, and what is freedom, and how are the two connected?' It is precisely because I believe that the two are very closely interwoven that I have framed such a question; and, of course, the whole argument of the talks is so constructed that it will bring to light and explain this intimate connection of two things that at first sight might seem to have little bearing upon one another.

It might be well first to ask what is the connection between the introduction contained in this pamphlet and the talks themselves. What has the history of the European moral tradition got to do with a philosophical discussion of freedom and reality? To this question the answer is simple. The desire for freedom and the love of freedom have played a great part in the history of Europe. We are proud of these old fights for freedom, and we enjoy the liberties which they won for us. At the same time there is a widespread discontent in Europe with the results of the struggle for liberty. Nobody seems really to be satisfied. Some people want less freedom and some want more. But few people stop to consider what it is that they want more or less of. Yet if we look back over the history of Europe we find that again and again people have fought to secure some change which they thought would make them free—the control of taxation by the people, for example, the right to worship God as they

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

pleased, the right to vote, and so on. And they have always found, when they achieved their purpose, that they had not really made themselves free. In the present day, people in thousands are thinking that all this talk of our sacred liberties is sentimental nonsense, because the freedom we are supposed to have is unreal. It doesn't really work out as freedom. They still feel bound and confined by constraints that they would like to shake off. That must mean that they find themselves forced to conform in their conduct to rules that cramp their spirits. The introductory essay has been concerned with the origin and history of the main set of rules and principles to which Europeans have always felt they ought to conform, and with the two great revolts against them in the name of freedom. Both of these achieved some of what we call our 'liberties', yet now, after the war, we feel on the whole that these liberties do not make our lives really free. The essay is trying to show why the freedom that these two movements achieved turned out to be *unreal*.

I would suggest, therefore, that after reading the essay, we might ask ourselves three simple questions. 'What do we mean by the freedom that we claim to possess as citizens of a free country? In what respects does it fail to satisfy us? Why is it ineffective? Lastly, in what direction would we like to be more free, if we could?'

At this stage we might well ask what philosophy has to say about all this. How can the philosopher help to solve these questions? This brings us to:

REALITY AND FREEDOM

TALK I.—ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

There are two main departments of philosophy—theoretical and practical. The first asks: 'What is real, and how can we know it?' The second asks: 'What is good, and how can we achieve it?' It is widely recognized that the second question is closely bound up with the notion of freedom. Now our social and personal question is about real and unreal freedom. So that philosophy ought to have quite a lot to say about our question. To start with, we only want to know what philosophers mean when they talk about reality. In preparation for this we might ask ourselves the following questions:

- (1) What kinds of things do we usually call unreal?
- (2) How do we feel about things we call unreal?
- (3) What is it, in general, that leads us to suspect anything to be unreal?

TALK II.—ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY

It is with the third of these questions that the second talk is concerned. It aims at showing that it is in discovering that we have been cheated or frustrated in some way that we come to suspect that there is unreality somewhere. Something is not what we thought it was. Listeners should think about cases of illusion or deception and try to discover how this suggestion fits them.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

The other point which comes to light in this talk is that such experiences of being frustrated or deceived tend to cramp our freedom of action, and so reveal a close connection between unreality and a lack of freedom. On this point again we should think of examples in our own experience.

TALK III.—THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY

When things go wrong our natural tendency is to blame anything or anybody but ourselves. But if someone else does this, our natural tendency is to think that it is his own fault. If we reflect calmly, however, we must conclude that sometimes the trouble is our own fault and sometimes it is not. But in any case it is the source of unreality in ourselves that is of greatest importance, because, unless we are right ourselves, we can't hope to mend what is wrong in the world outside us. We must attend first to the cases in which our deception or frustration is our own fault.

There are two main sources of unreality in ourselves. We may think wrongly or we may feel wrongly. We may think that we know where to find something when we want it, and discover in an emergency that it is not where we thought it was. Or we may be angry with someone when there is no real cause for it. Both these kinds of error will affect our behaviour and prevent us from dealing with our situation in a satisfactory way.

The main questions which this talk raises, then, are as follows:

REALITY AND FREEDOM

(1) How may we ourselves be to blame for the mistakes and failures which destroy or curtail our freedom?

(2) How do we come to have false beliefs?

(3) How do we come to have wrong feelings?

(4) What do we mean when we say that people deceive themselves?

TALK IV.—ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

In this talk we shall go into the question of false beliefs in more detail. We shall see that unreality in our thought is always a failure to get into touch with reality outside us. This will raise the following questions:

(1) How can we think that things are not what they are?

(2) How does this break between what we think and what is real affect:

(a) our freedom of thought?

(b) our freedom of action?

TALK V.—ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS

This talk will raise the corresponding questions about mistakes in our emotional life.

(1) How do our feelings come to be out of harmony with the real state of the persons or things which arouse them?

(2) What effect has such a disharmony between

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

our feelings and real situations upon our own emotional life?

(3) How does it affect our freedom?

N.B. It is by our feelings that we get into touch with the value of things, and if our feelings are at fault we get out of touch with real value. Feelings which are out of touch with reality are sometimes called 'sentimental'.

TALK VI.—ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

In this talk we shall combine the results of the preceding two. Our own conscious life is a combination of thinking and feeling, so the reality of persons depends upon the combination of real belief and real feeling. In this connection we should ask:

(1) How does a mistaken belief affect our feeling, and how does a mistaken feeling affect our judgment?

(2) What is the effect upon us when our beliefs and our feelings are not in harmony?

This leads us to consider the fact that some people are more real to us than others. What, then, do we mean when we say a person is unreal? We shall see that this depends upon our beliefs and our feelings being in harmony with theirs. So the question of friendship enters into the discussion. The best preparation for this discussion will be to think over our own experiences of friendship, to discover how some are more real than others and to try to account for these variations in reality.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

TALK VII.—ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY BEING FREE

We are now prepared to go on to the discussion of freedom. We shall ask first what we mean by being free. This is the kind of question that is best answered by taking examples. If we start by asking under what conditions we *say* that a man is free, and then under what conditions we ourselves *feel* free, we can perhaps decide that there are various kinds of freedom because there are various kinds of constraint.

(1) What are the external conditions which prevent us from being free?—want of money? political oppression? etc.

(2) What are the things *in us* which prevent us from being free? fear of consequences? ignorance? etc.

We shall come to see that freedom means spontaneity—doing what we want to do without constraint, either in us or outside us. We should consider especially freedom in our relations with other people.

TALK VIII.—ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM

We go on now to discuss three different kinds of freedom, which correspond to three different kinds or levels of reality which we recognize. There is the inorganic reality of matter, the organic reality of plant and animal life, and the personal reality of human life. Now anything is 'free' when it spontaneously expresses its own nature to the full in activity. We talk of matter falling 'freely' through space. So persons are free when they express their own nature to the full

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

without constraint. But since persons are both material bodies and living animals and something more that makes them human, their full freedom must include the two lower types of freedom. Thus personal freedom includes within it an economic freedom concerned with bodily needs, a social freedom concerned with the general expression of life in society, as well as the spiritual freedom of thought and emotion which is its peculiar characteristic.

Now morality and freedom are closely bound up together. The good life is simply the free life—the life which fully and spontaneously expresses our own reality. But it is possible to base our morality on any of the three kinds of freedom, and so to get either a complete or a more or less partial idea of the good life. I call these three moralities mechanical, social and personal.

There is much food for thought here, but I shall suggest only a few simple and practical questions.

(1) Can a man be free who has not the economic resources which he needs? Is poverty compatible with freedom?

(2) Is a man who is very wealthy necessarily free? If not, why not?

(3) Would a man living on a desert island with plenty of resources be free? What does association with other people contribute to our freedom?

(4) Can we be free if our beliefs are false or our feelings wrong? Is it freedom to live in a fool's paradise?

REALITY AND FREEDOM

TALK IX.—MECHANICAL MORALITY

This talk will attempt to show that the idea that goodness consists in obeying the moral law is wrong. It is based upon the idea of material or economic freedom. It is wrong because it destroys spontaneity by subjecting us to an external authority. I suggest the following preparatory questions:

(1) Can a person think freely if he is told beforehand what he ought to think?

(2) Can a person feel freely if he is told beforehand what he ought to like and dislike?

(3) Can a person be real if he believes what he is told to believe without thinking, and can he be really satisfied if he is not allowed to discover for himself what he really likes?

TALK X.—SOCIAL MORALITY

The second type of false morality comes up next for discussion. It rests on the belief that freedom consists in the service of social progress, and it is a very powerful force at the present day. It is the morality of service and self-sacrifice. It is false because it sets up a constraint upon personal spontaneity, and at the most can only achieve political freedom. Here are a few questions which its consideration gives rise to:

(1) If everybody served everybody else and sacrificed themselves to everybody else, who would get the benefit?

(2) If you do things for other people, will it not

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

destroy their capacity to do things for themselves—and for others?

(3) Is it possible to be free if you have to act so as to please other people?

TALK XI.—PERSONAL MORALITY

True morality depends upon personal freedom. That, as we saw, depends on personal reality. Personal reality involves two things—(a) real thinking and real feeling and a harmony between them and (b) mutual relations between real people, or real friendship. It demands, therefore, that we should think and feel for ourselves, and bring our thinking and feeling into harmony. This we call 'being ourselves'. It demands further that we should express our real selves to other people and let them express themselves freely to us. This we call 'self-expression'. Here listeners who are at all in touch with modern literature and modern social movements will find plenty of questions which arise. I shall confine myself to the suggestion of one or two which are so simple and fundamental that they are apt to be overlooked:

(1) What do we mean when we say a person is 'not himself'?

(2) What prevents us from 'being ourselves' with other people?

(3) What are the things that prevent, or make difficult, our expressing ourselves freely to other people (a) in our circumstances? (b) in other people? (c) in ourselves?

REALITY AND FREEDOM

TALK XII.—SELF-REALIZATION

The concluding talk will sum up the conclusions of the whole series by putting together the main points which have been brought to light. A true morality, depending upon personal freedom, would be a morality of personal self-realization. Now self-realization is in danger of becoming the catchword of the day. It is important to know what we mean by it. To realize oneself one must *be* oneself. To be oneself one must achieve personal freedom, and one must exercise that freedom in expressing one's real self to others. We have, therefore, to put together all the ideas which we have discussed before we can see what self-realization is and how it can be achieved. There are two main things on which it depends—sincerity and friendship. Sincerity is the virtue of expressing what we really think and what we really feel. Friendship is the relationship with other persons which makes this really possible. We are left, therefore, with three main questions:

- (1) What do we mean by sincerity—in thought and in feeling?
- (2) Why is it so difficult to be sincere?
- (3) How is it that real friendship between two people makes sincerity between them possible and easy?

In conclusion, let me advise all listeners who are interested in preparing themselves beforehand for

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

these talks to concentrate upon simple concrete examples of the various topics under discussion, and to disabuse themselves of the idea that there is anything abstract and technical involved. We shall be concerned throughout with the simplicities of ordinary life and nothing else. Our difficulties will arise only because the simplest problems are many sided, and we have to try to hold all the sides together.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

I

ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

I AM convinced that it is important that we should begin to be interested in philosophy. Not in the dry and learned disputes of the academic philosophies; not at all! But in living, contemporary philosophy, the philosophy of our own post-war twentieth century life. Philosophy, just like art or religion or politics, goes dry and barren and meaningless when most people are not interested in it. It really comes to life when the mass of men begin to feel the need of it, to call for it, to support the struggling intelligence of the philosopher with sympathy, with the sense that what he does matters to men.

It is important in a very special way, just now, that we should understand our own position in the history of Europe, and understand it vitally, in the philosophic way. Philosophy is the attempt to understand the meaning of human experience in the world. So, when it is real philosophy, it is the understanding of real human experience, and springs hot out of life itself. There are generations, sometimes whole centuries, when it is not vitally important to understand

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

life; when it is enough to live it. But ours is not one of them. For us it is essential that we should try to understand. I want to explain that first of all, and it will be an explanation of what philosophy is and what the need for it is.

Philosophy is an effort to understand. Now, we can try to understand things just for the fun of it, to exercise our intelligence or to satisfy our curiosity. It is exciting, if you are good at it, to try to guess riddles and solve problems. We like solving mysteries or having them cleverly solved for us. That is why there is such a run on detective stories at the libraries. And a great deal of philosophy (and science, too, for that matter) has its source in that love of solving problems. It is a good thing and a pleasant thing, provided you like it. But after all it is just a game, not really serious. On the other hand, it can often be a really serious matter to understand a situation; it may even be a matter of life and death. It is vitally important for a general in warfare to understand what the enemy is doing. He gets scraps of information from scouts and spies and aeroplanes. He has to piece it all together and discover what it all means. If the information is scanty, he must guess the answer to his problems and on the correctness of his guessing the fate of an empire may depend.

Understanding is a good game when you can choose your problems because they happen to interest you, and nothing very important is at stake. But it is not a game at all, it is a serious business when the problems

ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

you have to solve are forced on you by life itself and there is no avoiding them; when it will make all the difference between success and disaster for you whether you understand or fail to understand. That is true of the problems of our private lives. It is also true, in history, of the problems that face nations and civilizations. The French monarchy at the close of the eighteenth century failed to understand what was happening to France; they failed to solve their problem; and the result was the French Revolution—Robespierre and the Terror and the Guillotine and the massacre of the aristocracy which had failed to understand. Russia failed to understand before the War, and the Bolshevik revolution was the result, with *its* terror and bloodshed. When life sets problems to men or to nations they must be solved, and on their solution their fate may depend.

Sometimes the problems which life sets in such a fashion are philosophic problems. They usually have a philosophical side to them. That happens particularly when the driving forces of a nation or even of a whole civilization are spent. In any human life or in any community of human beings there is a special, unique kind of energy which keeps it going, something that has a religious quality about it, a driving vitality by which it lives. It is something like this that we mean when we talk of *joie de vivre* or *élan vital* or the life force. But these are rather stupid phrases, because they leave out of account the special uniqueness that always belongs to the energy which is the deep source

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of the livingness of a human being or a human community. Its most spontaneous expression is the loveliness of art; its completest and most powerful expression is religion. Perhaps it would be best to call it the 'faith' of a man or of a community of men. So long as a man's faith is bright in him, even though he could never put it into words, he lives by it. His life has a real meaning and significance for him. He is equal to the problems which life sets him, and he triumphs. A community of men, a nation or a civilization lives by its faith in the same way. While its faith is robust and vigorous the community really is alive and feels alive. It is expansive and buoyant and courageous. It expresses its faith in spontaneous freedom, in its social customs, in its political activities, in its art and its religion. There is meaning in it, and it feels the meaning and lives it. So long as its soul is alive in this spontaneous way its problems are never very deep. It is too strong to be forced to stop and think and understand its inner life.

There are crises, however, when a man's soul or the soul of a civilization goes sick, and the flame of faith burns very low. Spontaneity and vitality begin to disappear. This is when disillusionment sets in and life begins to seem meaningless. When that happens we can no longer face up to the problems that life sets us; we grow afraid and timid. In such a crisis reflection and understanding are essential. The vital necessity of understanding our own bodily mechanism comes from the fact of disease; and the science of

ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

medicine is forced upon us by the necessity of dealing with the diseases of the body, not with its health. So, in the current of our social history, understanding is a luxury when the energy of faith is in full tide; but when faith is at the ebb, it is an urgent necessity. Philosophy is essential when religion fails.

The failure of religion is a sure symptom of a diminishing life energy in our culture and civilization. Instead of faith, we have doubts; instead of being carried along in the full stream of social development, with a conviction that what we are doing is significant and full of meaning, we are carrying on with strain and effort and wondering whether it is worth while. There is no need to deplore this, or to fear, as some people fear, that the end of the world is upon us. It isn't. But something has come to an end, something that has been taken for granted for a long time; and something new is upon us. The war killed the faith of the nineteenth century, and we are living in the uncomfortable period when a new faith is germinating. And it is in such periods of inner revolution that the problems which are forced upon us are philosophical problems.

Every human being who is really alive and therefore every community of live men and women has a consciousness of life which is its own, an outlook upon the world which is special to itself. We talk, for example, about the spirit of Christianity, or the Greek view of life, or the mind of the Middle Ages. What do we mean? We mean, I think, that there is a unity of

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

some kind underlying all the superficial differences, something that is left out even when you have stated all the *facts* about them; a peculiar attitude to life, a peculiar way of approaching the tasks and activities of life. It is something that expresses itself equally in their religion and their art, their politics and forms of social intercourse. It is what I have just called their 'faith'. Now it is this inner life of the spirit which philosophy is trying to understand. Suppose that some friend were to ask you 'What do you make of life?' He would be setting you a philosophical problem. He would be asking you to 'express your faith', to define the 'meaning' which life has for you. The effort to answer him would be an effort to understand your own experience philosophically. Or suppose that you were a young man faced with the choice between two occupations for life—as an engineer in South Africa or a teacher in England. You might weigh up the advantages of each job—salary, expectations of promotion, living at home or abroad, social opportunities and so on. On the other hand you might ask yourself a more profound question. You might say to yourself 'What do I really want to make of my life? What is the real meaning of life for me, and which of these occupations will enable me to realize it best?' In that case you would be asking a philosophical question. You would again be attempting to understand the inner significance of your own life, to express your own spirit, to frame an ideal for yourself which would be in harmony with your own faith.

ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

You see, then, that philosophical problems are problems of the inner significance of life, individual or social life. That is the core of philosophy. It is from that particular angle that the philosopher looks upon the world and all its furniture and movement. He must look outwards for his answers. Because we can only understand the meaning of life in terms of the meaning of the world in which we live. After all, we are part of the world, it is built into us, it dictates to us the terms on which we can live at all. If we want to live significantly, we must first live somehow, and we must then discover what kind of significance life can have in a world like this. So that a great deal of philosophy is very much concerned with the nature of the world we live in. But for all that it is always in relation to the inner meaning of human life that the philosopher undertakes these elaborate investigations into the nature of the material world or into the origins of life.

Now let us be a little more definite and particular. There are two main divisions of philosophy, theoretical philosophy and practical philosophy. How do they arise? Well! we have seen that the great problem of philosophy is the significance of human life. Now that problem is very different for an old person whose life is nearly over, and for a young person who is just entering upon it. The old man looks back reflectively, thinking over his experience and trying to sum up its meaning. He stands now outside life as a spectator, pondering. But the young man is looking forward;

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

and when he seeks to understand the meaning of life it is because he wants to know how to live it. His problem is a problem of how to make life significant, not merely to discover the significance that there has been in it. The old man's interest is theoretical, the young man's is practical.

Thus we can try to understand the significance of life in two ways. We may look reflectively to the past and try to understand what life has meant, what its significance has been. Or we may look forward to the future and try to understand what significance can be given to human life, what life may be made to mean, practically. Thus, there arises the distinction between theoretical philosophy, which takes life as given and seeks to understand it; and practical philosophy, which takes life as a possibility to be achieved and seeks to understand how to live it.

The central problem of theoretical philosophy is set in the question, 'What is real?' I shall try to explain shortly the meaning of that question. If we reflect upon our experience we find that it is a very mixed bag. Most of it we can't even remember—it has so little significance for us now. We have lots of experiences to which we pay little heed. They are commonplace and habitual. Some of our experience remains with us—the significant experiences remain. Some of it is illusory or imaginary—our dreams, for instance. It is hard even to remember our dreams when we awake, and they soon fade out of the picture. A good deal of our experience has been unsatisfactory. We are

ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

ashamed of some of it. We laugh at some of the things we believed or valued. But there are also parts of it which were, and have remained, really significant. There are times when we really lived, and really got at the meaning of life. There are beliefs which we have retained, which experience has tested for us and which we acknowledge as the truth. There are actions which we are proud to have performed, and which we wish to repeat, because they were just right.

These are the significant things in our experience, the real things, the important things. And it is to them we look when we try to discover the significance that life has had for us. Whatever has this importance for us, whatever on reflection we find we must take account of, has reality for us. The rest is unimportant, meaningless, more or less unreal. It lacks the hall-mark which makes it sterling. If, then, we are going to give a philosophical account of our experience of the world, it will be an expression of what we have come to think is real. But that is only the first step. We shall want to know whether our account of the inner reality of life is not mistaken. It will probably disagree with the accounts that other people give. We shall require to criticize it and test it, to compare it with others. Because we can so easily think we have got hold of something real when it is merely counterfeit. This testing and criticizing of the expressions of reality which people have put forward in their accounts of what is real is the second important part of theoretical philosophy. That is why so

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

much philosophy is concerned with the problem of knowledge. We want to know how we can test our beliefs about reality, how we can discover whether they are really true.

In the same general way, the problem of practical philosophy is the problem of freedom. 'How can we be free?' is one way of stating the general question. That is because all activities which are really significant for us are spontaneous. It is the feeling of constraint and bondage in our activities that makes them seem unsatisfactory to us. The sense of freedom is our guarantee that we are making the best of life. When it is lacking we are thwarted and forced to live in a way that does not express our sense of the meaning of life. That is why the old question of 'Free-Will' has always stood at the centre of moral philosophy. If we are not free, then life has no practical significance for us, however much theoretical significance it may have. All the questions of practical philosophy, all the problems of how we ought to act and use our lives, have the problem of freedom at the root of them. Indeed practical philosophy has as its task nothing but the discovery of the conditions of free living.

Now this talk is a very general and preparatory one. And I have carried it as far as is necessary for the purposes of an introduction to the course. The talks which are to follow will get down to details and carry out the investigation which this introductory talk has suggested. The next five talks will be concerned with the question, 'What is real in human life?' The last six

ABOUT PHILOSOPHY AND ITS PROBLEMS

will be about freedom. I shall be attempting to do what I have suggested philosophy should always do, to give my own answer to the question, 'What is the significance of human life?' But there is one point left over from to-night's discussion which I should like to mention in conclusion. Is there any connection between the problems of theoretical philosophy and of practical philosophy, between Reality and Freedom? There is; a very close connection indeed. Freedom depends upon Reality. The sense of constraint in human life is always the result of unreality in human life. We are free only when we are real. And it is because there is such a chaos of unreality in modern life that it lacks the sense of freedom and loses significance. These talks on philosophy will have this point always in the background, and I should like listeners to have it always in mind; for it is the thread that will bind all the points that we discuss into a single whole. 'Freedom depends upon reality'—that is the inner spirit, the organizing thought of our talks on philosophy during these twelve weeks.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

II

ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY

WE ARE going to plunge to-night right into our special subject. Freedom depends on Reality. So we must start off with reality. How are we to begin?

I think we should begin with a very puzzling question. 'How can there be anything unreal?' If anything exists at all, surely it must *really* exist, surely it must be real! If a thing is unreal—like the sea-serpent, for instance—then it just doesn't exist. There is no such thing. Unreal things are just non-existent. That seems quite simple.

But wait a moment. There are people who think that the sea-serpent exists; and when I talked about the sea-serpent I was talking about something, and you knew what I meant. So you and I were both thinking about something which we agree does not exist. And we agree, too, that there are some people who think about the same thing as we are thinking about—the sea-serpent—and who think that it really exists. So I must ask you how we can think about something unreal, something that just doesn't exist.

ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY

If we think about the sea-serpent, we think about something. So the sea-serpent is something. It is something unreal; and there *are* unreal things. There *are* things that don't exist. Unreal things aren't just nothing.

I expect you want to remind me that unreal things are imaginary things. We imagine the sea-serpent, and we think about what we imagine. But nobody has ever seen a sea-serpent. Well! I might ask you how we can imagine something that doesn't exist; for if we imagine it we *imagine* that it exists. But I shall refrain from pressing that point. Instead, let me ask you whether you are sure that nobody has ever seen a sea-serpent. 'Of course not,' you say. But why are you sure? 'Because', you say, 'nobody can have seen a thing that doesn't exist. It is impossible.' Now that is just prejudice. I know plenty of people who have seen ghosts. I don't believe, myself, that ghosts exist; but I'm quite sure that people see them. In dreams we continually see things that don't exist. If we look along the railway line we see the rails converging in the distance; and they don't. We know they don't, but we go on seeing it all the same. I remember seeing a friend of mine in a bus on which I was travelling; so I went up to him and tapped him on the shoulder—and it wasn't him. So you see, we often see things that aren't there, and I expect that quite a number of people have seen the sea-serpent, even if he doesn't exist.

Ah! you say, that's very clever talk, but it's just a

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

trick. People don't *really* see these things, they only *think* they see them; they really imagine them. Well! I don't think so. It seems to me that they see them, and to say they only *think* they see them is a trick of language. We don't like to admit that we see things that aren't there. But I'm not going to quarrel about words. I want to come to the really important point, and that is this. Whether you see the thing or only think you see it makes no difference to *you*. If it isn't there and you think it is, then it is there as far as you are concerned; it is real *for you*; and you will behave exactly as you would if it were really there. If you think you see a ghost then the fact that you don't really see it won't make a pennyworth of difference to you. You'll be just as excited or terrified. The unreal thing will enter into your experience and it will be thoroughly effective. The ghost will spoil a good night's sleep as effectively as a real burglar.

Now this is a principle of far-reaching importance and I want you to consider it carefully. It is not what is real but what we think is real, not reality but what we take for reality, that directly determines our behaviour and so controls the current of our lives. We live by what we *think* is real, and if what we think is real isn't real, then so much the worse for us. Let us take another kind of example. There are plenty of people who think that everybody else is trying to do them down. Such people are suspicious of everybody. If anyone does them a kindness, they wonder in themselves, 'What is he after now? What does he want to

ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY

get out of me?' In most cases they will be completely mistaken—but that makes no difference. They think that people want to do them down, and that suspicion governs all their relations with other people. With the result that they poison the very springs of human relationship; they make friendship impossible; they grow embittered in themselves, become lonely and little-minded, and make everybody else constrained and uneasy and distrustful. Just try to imagine what life would be like if everybody felt like that. And it is simply the result of unreality in people's experience. They think that something is real which isn't real at all.

So it is with nations. If one nation in Europe thinks that the other nations want to do her down, then that nation will poison the springs of international relationships and make disarmament and peace impossible. And whether she is right or wrong about it won't make any difference. So long as she thinks that this ill-will against her exists she will behave as if it really existed; she will build up the biggest army and navy she can afford, and force the other nations to do the same. And you will notice—though this is another point which we are not really considering now—that she will tend to produce the ill-will that she is afraid of. We can sometimes bring things into existence just by thinking that they exist when they don't.

We shall take this as our first conclusion then, and try to keep it clearly in our minds. *Unreal things can be real for us, because we can think they are real; and if we do we behave as if they were real.*

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

Now we shall go on to another point. So far we have been assuming that when we say a thing is *real* we simply mean that it *exists*. I want to show you that we mean more than this. We mean also that it is important, or significant. Let me give you a few assorted examples to show you what I mean. We sometimes say that the characters in a novel are very real. It is rather difficult to say what we mean exactly by that, but obviously we don't mean simply that they exist. We know that they don't; they are imaginary people, fictitious characters. Yet we say that they are *real*. Why? I think it is because they have a certain significance for us that makes us treat them as if they existed. We can believe in them. They have the value of actual persons for us. We feel that they *could* exist, even if we know that they don't. They have the same kind of significance for us as the actual people we meet.

Now look at one or two other examples. A counterfeit half-crown is not a real half-crown. It exists all the same. Here we have a case of something that we say is unreal even though we know that it *does* exist. This again would seem to have something to do with its significance or its value for us. We might say that the counterfeit half-crown pretends to be a real one. It pretends to be what it is not. Now of course the coin doesn't pretend, it just is what it is, a piece of white metal having all the appearance, at first sight, of a half-crown. But we are apt to think that it is something that it is not; indeed we are *meant* to accept it for what it is not; it is meant to have the significance

ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY

of half-a-crown for us, so that we shall think it is what it isn't and behave accordingly. So we say that it isn't a real half-crown.

Again, we often distinguish between a man's real beliefs and his professed beliefs. In this case we may mean either of two things. We may mean either that he pretends to believe something that he *knows* he doesn't believe. Then he is deliberately deceiving us. Or we may mean that *he thinks* he believes something that he doesn't really. Then he is not deceiving us—at least not deliberately. He is deceiving himself. This is a very important point that we shall have to consider specially in another talk. For the moment we only want to notice that when we say, for instance, that a person doesn't *really* believe in God, though he thinks he does, we mean that his belief has no significance for his life. It doesn't influence his behaviour, it is powerless and ineffective. It is a mere opinion. Though he thinks that God exists, he behaves as though He did not. He might as well not believe in God at all, for all the difference it makes.

So with our feelings. When a young woman, faced with a proposal of marriage, asks herself 'Do I *really* love him?' what does she mean? I don't know; but she is obviously aware that our feelings may be unreal. She is afraid that what she feels for the man may not be love, although she thinks it is. And naturally she doesn't want to wake up some day to discover that she never really loved her husband, but was deceived by her own feelings into thinking that she did.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

Now if you think over these examples—and I'm sure you can add to their number indefinitely—you will find that they all have something in common. They all recognize the presence, in our experience, of something that is sham, that is deceitful, that pretends to be what it isn't. What is called unreal would seem always to be something that, as it were, claims to be what it is not, so that we are apt to think that it is what it isn't. Unreality is something that tends to mislead us, to trap us into mistakes and errors. There are things in the world, in other people, in ourselves that seem to be what they are not; so that we are apt to think they are one thing when they really are something different. This is our second general conclusion, which supplements the first. The first conclusion was that 'unreal things can be real for us, because we can think they are real'. The second is more definite; it is this. *'When we take something unreal to be real, we think that something is what it is not. There are lots of things which seem to be what they are not and which tend to deceive us.'*

Now let us take stock and see exactly where we have got to. I think myself that the important point is this. When we say that something is real we don't *mean* that it exists. Why? Because we say that some things that don't exist are real—like some of the characters in a novel or a play; and we say that some things that do exist—like the counterfeit half-crown—are not real. What then do we mean when we say that something is real? We mean that it is a significant thing, that it means something to us, that we have to take

ON OUR EXPERIENCE OF UNREALITY

account of it, that it is worth attending to. You sometimes listen to a wireless concert in which one piece of music after another fails to interest you. You are just thinking of switching off and reading the evening paper instead. Then suddenly something happens to you. The orchestra begins to play another piece of music, and the tiredness and listlessness you were feeling disappears; you stop being bored; you come alive and sit up in your chair and you say, 'Hallo! listen to that; that's *real* music.' Now why did you say it was *real* music? Not because it existed! No. Because it was the sort of music that you had *got* to listen to: it meant something to you; it was worth attending to; in a wilderness of dreary, meaningless, insignificant sound, it suddenly shone out like a shooting star. It affected you powerfully and put life into you. It was significant. That is what it means to say that something is real.

And then, by contrast, you see that the *unreal* things are the insignificant things, the things that don't matter, that you needn't take any account of. They are the things that don't give you the feeling of aliveness and interest, that don't pull you together and brace you up and make you feel that here is something worth while, something that makes life good and vivid. The unreal things cheat you; they cheat you of life. They fail to make good, to be what you expected them to be. They are shams.

Well, now, let us link this up with the big question about a man's 'faith' that I proposed to you in my first talk. We are practical creatures, and so we *must*

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

pay attention to things that exist. We must be realists; and the actual world we live in, with its social system and its political organization and so on as well as its sea and soil and air and trees and sunlight, must be taken into account, or we shall assuredly come to a bad end. But unless something is real for us that doesn't exist, unless we believe in something more than the things that exist around us, we have no faith in us. And if we have no faith, we have no driving energy and life becomes boring and meaningless, not worth living. That is to say *life* becomes unreal for us.

On the other hand, we must not forget our first point. Things may seem real to us when they aren't; we may think they are real when they are not. So our faith may be a sham faith. It may arise from thinking that something is important and significant which really isn't. That may make life seem real, and give us the feeling of vitality and energy and courage. But we are really paying our way with counterfeit coin and in the end we are sure to be found out. Sooner or later we shall discover that we have deceived ourselves and our faith will let us down. We must have a faith; but it must be a faith that is placed in something that is real and not in something that we merely think is real. Otherwise we shall be sadly disillusioned in the end, as Cardinal Wolsey was. Do you remember his words when he found out that he had been let down? 'Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my king He would not in mine age have left me naked to mine enemies.'

REALITY AND FREEDOM

III

THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY

LAST WEEK we discussed the fact of unreality. I suggested to you certain familiar examples of it and tried to say what it was. To-night I am going to talk about its origins, about where it comes from.

First of all, we shall recall the simple result of last week's talk about what is unreal. Unreal things are facts; we do experience them. There are unreal things and they can be very important. People have been frightened out of their lives by bogeys and inspired to deeds of heroism by the purest fancies, like Don Quixote. That was our first point. The second was this: when we say that something is real, we mean that it is significant. The real things are the things that we must take account of. If we ask what a man believes in, we are asking what has central significance for him, that is to say, what he thinks is most real.

Now we come to the curious problem which arises when we take these two points together. When we experience unreality, it is always because we are thinking that something is real when it isn't. Only things that we think are real can be unreal. Nothing

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

can be unreal in itself. It just is what it is. A counterfeit half-crown is a real piece of white metal. The ghost is really a white sheet in the moonlight. The unreality comes in because we think they are something else, and so they have a false significance for us. The curious result of this is that nothing can be unreal unless we think it is real. So long as we think something is real we can never know that it is not. And the moment we discover that anything is unreal it is no longer unreal. It is only while we are actually cheated that we experience unreality. The moment we detect the sham—the moment we realize that the ghost is only a white sheet in the moonlight—we no longer think it is a ghost. The ghost just vanishes and the real thing takes its place. So, seemingly, nothing can ever be actually unreal *for us*. If it is real and we are not deceived, it is real for us. We think it is real and it is. If it is unreal, it is still real for us; we think it is real. We can never, it would seem, think that anything is unreal. Because that would be to think that it is something that we know that it isn't. So long as we are deceived by the counterfeit half-crown we think that it is a real one. The moment we discover that it is counterfeit we know that it isn't a half-crown. And then we know what it really is. We can't go on thinking that it is a half-crown any longer.

How then do we ever come to think that something is unreal, or to say that something is unreal? There are two answers to that. One is that we remember that we were taken in. We remember that we have

THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY

changed our minds. Whatever we believe in for the moment we think is real. But we know that some things which we used to believe in we believe in no longer. Some things we used to think real we now think are unreal. People who have been disillusioned about something that they believed in—about love, for example—are apt to say that love is a fraud. That is because they are not in love at the moment. If they fall in love again they will change their minds again. So it is because we have discovered that what we took for reality was sham that we come to say that some things are unreal. If we didn't remember these former deceptions we would never think that anything was unreal. There are people like that; people who 'live in the moment', as we say. To them, whatever interests them is just real. They are always changing their beliefs because they accept everything in the present at its face value. They never learn from experience. Everything is real to them just because it is there, before their eyes or in their fancy. Such happy-go-lucky souls are very entertaining, if you only meet them occasionally; but it is impossible to take them seriously. They are essentially unreal people, living in a world of illusion.

This simple fact, that we are able to think that things are unreal because we remember how things have deceived us in the past, leads to important results. It teaches us to suspect that we may be deceived, and to examine what we think is real in case it may not be. So we come to be on our guard against

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

unreality. A bank teller is less likely to be taken in by a counterfeit half-crown than most of us, just because he is on his guard. In general, therefore, if we will only learn from experience, we are not likely to be deceived twice by the same thing. And also, we come to recognize that there are things which are apt to deceive us. We learn to know which they are and to be on the look-out for them.

But there is a second fact which makes us aware of unreal things. It is the fact that we are not the only people in the world. We find that other people believe in things that we do not believe in; they think things significant that we think of no importance. They think that things exist—like ghosts—which we think do not exist, and so on. Now, whenever we discover such differences of belief between ourselves and other people, we are forced to recognize that one of us must be wrong, or perhaps both of us. The same thing can't be both a ghost and a white sheet. In that way, out of our differences of opinion and belief and feeling about things we are driven to recognize that there is unreality about somewhere, if only we could discover where it is. Somebody is thinking that something is what it is not.

How then can we discover whether things are what we think they are? That is the obvious question, and the really important question. My simple answer to it is 'by being real ourselves', and the rest of the talks will be taken up with it; they will be an attempt to explain what it means. For the moment I want only

THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY

to say one or two simple things about this answer, which are preliminary. In the first place, the discovery that we have been deceived, that we have taken things to be real which were not so, that we have thought things were significant when they were unimportant, is apt to generate scepticism. It puts us on our guard against deception, and makes us suspicious. And that may go so far that we suspect that we are being deceived all the time. May not all our beliefs be wrong? Can we be sure about anything? Once we begin to ask questions like these, we discover that we can suspect anything—any belief, any feeling, any person—of unreality. I remember the story of an undergraduate in Oxford who was discovered at five o'clock in the morning rushing about the college quadrangle in a state bordering on delirium because he had been trying to prove to himself that he existed. He couldn't do it. That is an extreme case. But you will find lots of people who suggest in discussion that all our experience may be just a dream. Of course that is mere speculation. Nobody can really believe that; and I for one don't think there is any use in discussing a view that nobody really believes in. It is sheer waste of time. Such discussions are unreal. Much more important is the deep scepticism into which we all sometimes fall when we feel that nothing matters, when life loses its significance for us. That is the essential scepticism. To feel that nothing is significant, that nothing matters, is to feel that nothing is real. The real is the significant, and to lose hold of the significance

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of the world in that fashion is the death of the spirit. I think that is what religion must mean by the 'second death', by the death of the soul. It is what we mean when we talk of Hell—a complete and final loss of reality, the disappearance of faith.

One further word about this real scepticism. It is not a thing that can be avoided by anyone who is seriously concerned about reality. There is no way of discovering what is real and what is not real except by learning, from our experience of disillusionment, that all our beliefs may be deceptive. Any attempt to bolster up our beliefs by refusing to face fact, or by relying upon other people, is just an attempt to escape from discovering that we are wrong. Scepticism is the way to the discovery of what is real in itself. If we never run the risk of finding out that all our beliefs are unreal we shall never have any chance of discovering what is really worth believing in. There is no use in living in a fool's paradise.

The other point I want to make now is this. The only way to discover unreality and get rid of it is by some practical test. Suppose that we think that our half-crown is a real one when it is counterfeit, what will happen? In all good faith we will offer it to someone else, to pay for something we want to buy. We will use it, and it may be accepted; it may go into circulation and remain in circulation for a long time. It will go on deceiving people, in fact, until some suspicious person, to whom it is offered, tests it. And it will break down in the test. I saw that happen the other day at

THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY

a tube station. A gentleman who was buying a ticket threw down a half-crown on the counter of the booking office. The clerk picked it up and dropped it again. Then he slipped it between two projecting metal teeth and bent it—and a piece broke off. And he handed back the broken pieces. Things are only discovered to be unreal *in use*. The only test of unreality is a practical test. This is the secret of science. It experiments. Science acts on the principle that if a belief is not true it won't work. So it takes a theory that claims to be true and tests it. False beliefs break down in practice in the long run. And that is as true of false ideals and false moralities, of false government and false religion. The unreal things are unmasked only by discovering that they won't do what they are supposed to do. And you can only find out whether they are unreal by trying them out in practice.

Now this leads me to my last point about the source of unreality in our experience. How should we answer the question 'Why was I deceived? Why did I take this unreal thing to be real?' It would, of course, depend upon the particular case what answer was the proper one. But I want to suggest that there are two attitudes we may take up. We may blame ourselves or we may blame someone else. We may throw the responsibility on someone else, or we may accept it ourselves. Both these attitudes are in a sense reasonable. The one completely absurd thing to do is to blame the thing itself. Things are what they are. It is no use to break the looking-glass because it shows you that you

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

are not so good-looking as you thought you were. It is just silly to swear at the footstool because you stubbed your toe on it. Unreality is always, as we have seen, the result of thinking. It has its source in us. The only real question is whether it has its source in me or in somebody else.

Now you could almost divide people into two classes on this score; into those who habitually throw the responsibility for their disillusionment on others and those who accept it themselves. During the last election I was travelling in a train, and one of my fellow-travellers, a small red-faced man in a bowler hat, who was very interested in the scenery, put his head out of the window to see something while the train was travelling fast, and his hat blew off. Without any hesitation he slammed the window shut and exclaimed, 'Confound Lloyd George!' An extreme example, I thought to myself, of the large class of people who want to shift all responsibility for their disappointments on to the government. I remember, too, a little incident at a dinner-party at which a charming lady, who had the misfortune to upset a tumbler of water, turned in her confusion towards her husband at the other end of the table and said: 'Oh Charles, how could you!' Another extreme example, but an illuminating one. Most of us have an instinctive and quite unconscious tendency to father our own mistakes on other people.

Now, of course, if we have discovered something unreal in our experience, it is nearly always possible

THE SOURCES OF UNREALITY

to shift the blame for our error on to someone else. Indeed, someone else may have been deliberately deceiving us. We may have accepted a belief on somebody's authority and discovered it was false. And the authority is to blame. Yet even when someone has deliberately deceived us it is *we* who are deceived. If we had taken more care or been less credulous we should not have been deceived. There is always something in ourselves that is responsible for any unreality we discover. It is we who thought that something was what it was not. It was in us that the unreal thing took root and grew. If we accept our beliefs from other people we do so at our own risk and must accept the consequences. And therefore it is the line of wisdom to look first for the source of unreality in ourselves; and then we can look for contributory causes outside ourselves. This is merely the old, sound rule: 'First cast out the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.' Unreality has its source in us. And the search for reality in the world must start with the search for our own reality.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

IV

ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

WE HAVE reached a turning-point in our discussion. We have to look at the problem of reality from a new standpoint, which is the proper standpoint. We have found that all unreality has its source in us. In summarizing last week's talk, therefore, I shall do it from this point of view.

Everything in the world is itself always, with the exception of ourselves. Everything else has its own definite nature and expresses its nature in its behaviour without the possibility of any deviation. Material things, plants and animals alike—they are all subject to a law which governs and determines whatever happens to them and in them. For this reason unreality cannot arise in them; they cannot be unreal. But men and women are different. They are not always themselves. They can be infected with illusions. Their nature can be distorted by error and deception. You can never say of any human being, as you can of any other being, that he is exactly what he is. *We can be unreal.*

The peculiar nature of persons lies in their power to

ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

know other things and other persons as they really are, and to value them at their true value. Our behaviour is not governed by a law in ourselves to which we necessarily conform, but by our knowledge and appreciation of things outside ourselves. We are not shut up within our own nature as other things are. In being ourselves we go beyond ourselves to reach the world. So when we are ourselves, when we are completely real, we live completely by our knowledge of what is not ourselves, in communion with the world. If you want a technical phrase to express this you might say that human nature is self-transcending.

Now, it follows from this that whenever we think that something is what it is not we are not being ourselves, since our nature consists in the power to know things as they are. Whenever we experience unreality we are so far unreal; we are not ourselves. Our real nature has been so far destroyed and frustrated. And if the point on which we are deceived is of great significance, the frustration of our nature will have great significance too (e.g., a persecution mania). There is one interesting corollary of this fact which I shall suggest for your discussion. It follows that a normal human being can only be an ideal human being. A normal person would have to be perfect. The normal case is the standard case, and the standard for human nature is complete reality. That, as we have seen, means the complete absence of illusion or mistake in his relations with the outside world.

We distinguish two aspects of our consciousness—

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

thought and feeling. These are two ways in which we make contact with the world. Though they are never completely separable, they do have a relative independence. And therefore I propose to deal with personal reality first from the side of our thinking and then from the side of our feelings. After we have dealt with them separately we shall have to study their connection with one another. To-night we are going to confine our attention to the thinking side of our nature and to ask, 'What do we mean by being real in our thinking?' And in *thinking* I include all the ways in which we know what things are and try to understand what they are.

Well now, if I ask, 'When are we real in our thinking?' I imagine that most people would say 'When what we think is true.' Now I don't deny that reality in thinking has something to do with truth. But the reality of thought is not the same thing as the truth of thought, and when we aim at being real in our thinking we should not aim at truth; otherwise we shall certainly miss it. It is much more important that our thought should be real than that it should be true. That is my theme to-night. I shall try to show you that a thought may be true and yet quite unreal; and also that a thought may be untrue and yet real. That will enable you to see that the important thing about our thinking is that it should be real, not that it should be true. For in fact, truth is an ultimate by-product of real thinking, just as happiness is an ultimate by-product of real living.

ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

We shall see this if we attend to different cases of unreal thinking. The real is the significant, and therefore, whenever we use our minds in a way that has no significance our thinking is unreal. This will occur, in the first place, if the things we think about have no real significance. We call such questions 'academic' questions, because they are so common in places of learning like schools and universities. We may discuss for hours, 'What would have happened if Germany had won the War?' And the discussion may be very acute and subtle and learned. But the question is completely unreal, and that infects the mind with unreality. It doesn't matter whether the conclusion is true or false. Even if it is true it has no real significance. It is just like the mediæval discussions about how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. Philosophers are particularly prone to discuss unreal questions. 'Can we know', they sometimes ask, 'that there is anybody in the world except ourselves?' You can't discuss that with anybody unless you know the answer. And if you decided that you couldn't know, it wouldn't make a pennyworth of difference to you. The answer, even if it were true, would have no significance.

Similarly, what we call 'speculative thought' or 'mere theory' is unreal thought, even though it may be true. Our thought is merely speculative when it thinks about real questions in an unreal way. But please don't run away with the idea that this kind of unreal thinking is the peculiar property of professional

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

thinkers. There is probably much less of it amongst them than amongst ordinary folk. What looks like mere theorizing to the uninitiated may be very real thinking for the expert. Thinking is not necessarily unreal because you or I can't understand it. But when people take a real question and remove it from its setting and think about it in general terms it becomes unreal; and it is astonishingly easy to do this. The question of the rights and wrongs of Mr. Gandhi's position and the non-resistance movement in India is a very real question. You have most of you discussed it or thought about it. In that case you will understand me when I say that it is difficult to think about it in a real way. The discussion gets up in the air very quickly and loses itself in a fog of generalities. General ideas and catch-words like 'National Rights', the 'Protection of Minorities', the necessity of maintaining prestige, 'Self-determination' and so on take the place of an honest attempt to grapple with the facts of the situation. The discussion becomes a matter of debate pure and simple, maintained by logical subtlety, and the best wits win. Or else the flame of the discussion dies for lack of fuel; we become aware that we are up in the air and unreal, and we lose interest. That is what I mean by mere theorizing. Real thinking starts with questions which are real, which are forced on us by the pressure of experience; and it proceeds hand in hand with experience, leaning on the facts. There is one sure way of discovering whether our generalizations are real

ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

or not and that is to stop and ask for an example. It is remarkable how often people can't give you an example of what they mean.

There is a third way in which thinking can be unreal. The question may be a real one, and it may be thought about in a real way, and the thinking may reach a true conclusion. But we stop there. We are content to hold a true opinion, and we resolutely refuse to let the opinion we hold influence our behaviour in any way. We are afraid of the consequences, perhaps. But more frequently we are simply not interested in the application of our opinions. We don't want to connect up our thought with our behaviour at all. Now when thought is so divorced from its application to life it is unreal, however true it may be. It is without significance. That is when we say that a man doesn't really believe what he professes. All thought that is not *meant* to go beyond its conclusions to their application is unreal thought, and unreal thought is a monstrosity. This is one of the main roots of unreality in us and in the world. We destroy the reality of our thinking nature if we divorce it from its application to life, or from its due influence on life.

Now this particular unreality, mischievous and monstrous as it is, has been erected as an ideal for thought. It is the ideal of knowledge for knowledge's sake. There is no significance whatever in knowing things just for the sake of knowing them and nothing more. The search for knowledge is either the search

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

for that which has a vital significance for human life or it is a relapse into unreality. Why then have we come to regard knowledge as good in itself? I shall tell you what I believe to be the real reason. We are afraid of the terrible power of thought to change the world we live in, to destroy our illusions, to force us to alter our habits and our social arrangements. We hate to be disturbed and to have the familiar unreality of our ordinary existence and beliefs shattered. There is an enormous, savage weight of inertia in us. If you look back on history you will remember how society has set up barriers against the great thinkers and teachers to prevent their thoughts having any effect upon people's lives. In the old days it was simpler to kill them outright. Nowadays we know a much better method. We do homage to thought. We make an ideal of it. 'Thought and knowledge are good in themselves,' we say. 'Let us all get as much knowledge as we can. Let the born thinker think to his heart's content and we will honour him and listen to him. But it must all end there. Knowledge is its own end.' And that is the death of real knowledge. Knowledge can be true and yet unreal, robbed of its proper significance.

Let me suggest, in a word, an important application of this which some of you might care to discuss. Educationalists are beginning to learn that it is of great importance that what children are taught should be real to them. The training of our minds should be from the very start a training in reality.

ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

Young minds should not be allowed to think in ways that are unreal for them about things that have no significance for them. But alas! our educational system has its own inertia and resists strongly. We still force our young people to learn all sorts of things—we call it ‘acquiring knowledge’—which have no significance for them and which never will have any. We store their minds with information and facts which make no contact with their living experience. The fortunate ones have a capacity for forgetting most of it when they leave school or college. But for most the effect is mischievous. It makes them hate thinking. It actually makes them stupid, as any good psychologist can tell you. And it furnishes their minds with such a mass of useless lumber that they are like those drawing-rooms we used to see in which there was no room to move about. It is easily possible to know too much. There are masses of things that we should refuse to know—and they are not merely the domestic affairs of our neighbours.

We see, then, how thought may be true without being real. We may ask, however, whether real thinking will always give us truth. The answer is, I believe, that that is a matter of faith. We may reasonably hope and believe that in the long run, if we think really we will reach truth. But there is no possible guarantee of that, and it is practically certain that we shall have to go through a good deal of error to reach it. Let me give you an example of this from science, for it is in the scientific field that real thinking is the

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

order of the day. A long time ago a famous chemist, who was investigating the weights of the atoms of the different chemical elements, was struck by the fact that if you called the weight of the atom of hydrogen one unit, a number of the other elements had atomic weights which were very nearly exact multiples of that unit weight, so that they could be expressed very nearly in whole numbers. He suggested the theory that the atomic weights of all the elements were exact multiples of that of the lightest element. But it was found on investigation that numerous elements would not fit into the scheme, and so the theory was discarded as false. But in our own day it has been discovered that these refractory elements are really a mixture of atoms of different weights in a certain proportion. The old theory was revived and investigated and discovered to be true after all.

The point of the example is this. The scientists were right in rejecting a theory that subsequently proved to be true. They would have been wrong to accept it, because it was not in accordance with their experience at the time, that is to say, with the available evidence. If they had accepted it they would have been preferring unreal speculative thinking to real thinking in terms of scientific experience. Yet by rightly insisting on being real in their thinking they inevitably rejected a truth. That is a principle of general application. If we think really, we shall run the risk of rejecting truth and accepting falsehood. We must always decide upon the available evidence.

ON BEING REAL IN OUR THINKING

If you are afraid of being wrong then you will have to be unreal. If you are desperately concerned about your beliefs being true you run the risk of holding views that are unreal. That is why so many people want somebody else to tell them what they ought to believe. They want an infallible authority who will secure them against the risk of error. But for real thought that is a false security.

Why, then, did I say that we could hope that in the long run real thinking would reach truth? Is there any ground for such a faith? Yes, there is. Real thinking is alive and on the move. It is continually testing and retesting its conclusions by living experience. As a result it is always gathering more experience to test itself by. Sooner or later it will discover its errors and be in a position to put them right. But unreal thinking has no chance of discovering whether it is true or false. It is divorced from the only test of truth—a growing, watchful experience of life. Real thought is marked by its readiness to change its mind as the increase of experience reveals its inadequacy. Unreal thought is far more fixed and self-consistent. It refuses to admit that it can be wrong; it twists or ignores the evidence that is forced upon it. It refuses to bring its beliefs to the test of practical experience. All its consistency and stability is only a proof that it is dead, not that it is true.

That is my conclusion to-night. Truth is an ultimate by-product of real thinking. Apart from the reality of the thought that maintains it truth is dead, useless

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

and insignificant. It is not so much truth that our minds are after as significant truth. Truth that has no vital significance is unreal and a mere nuisance. It is reality that matters, and if we take care that our thought is *real*, truth will look after itself.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

V

ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS

LAST WEEK we were discussing what it meant to be real in our thinking. We found that it was not the same as holding true opinions, but rather a complete honesty in the effort to make our thinking significant for life. To-night we are going to look into the reality of the other side of human nature, the 'feeling' side, which includes the whole range of our emotional experience, from simple feelings of pleasure and pain to the most complicated emotional states of love and reverence and the loftiest reaches of desire. This is more difficult for us modern Europeans to discuss, because we are mostly rather badly at sea in regard to feeling and emotion. It was largely with reference to this point that I prepared the pamphlet which accompanies this course, explaining the historical reasons why our emotional life has remained so primitive and undeveloped. I hope that most of my listeners have read that pamphlet, because it will make what I have to say to-night much easier to understand.

The first point that I want to insist on is the primary

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

importance of feeling in human life. What we feel and how we feel is far more important than what we think and how we think. Feeling is the stuff of which our consciousness is made, the atmosphere in which all our thinking and all our conduct is bathed. All the motives which govern and drive our lives are emotional. Love and hate, anger and fear, curiosity and joy are the springs of all that is most noble and most detestable in the history of men and nations. Scientific thought may give us power over the forces of nature, but it is feeling that determines whether we shall use that power for the increase of human happiness or for forging weapons of destruction to tear human happiness in pieces. Thought may construct the machinery of civilization, but it is feeling that drives the machine; and the more powerful the machine is, the more dangerous it is if the feelings which drive it are at fault. Feeling is more important than thought.

Now it is the tradition of our society that this is not true. We are inclined to think of feeling as something a little ignominious, something that ought to be subordinated to reason and treated as blind and chaotic, in need of the bridle and the whip. I am convinced that this is a mistake. It is in the hands of feeling, not of thought, that the government of life should rest. And in this I have the teaching of the founder of Christianity on my side, for he wished to make love—an emotion, not an idea—the basis of the good life. The second point that I wish to insist upon, therefore, is that feeling is not blind and chaotic and disorderly,

ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS

demanding to be controlled and ordered by reason. It has its own principle of order in itself, and will control and guide itself if it is given the chance. No doubt primitive, uncultivated feeling is chaotic and unruly, but so is primitive, uncultivated thought. And if our thought is orderly and sane in comparison with our feelings, that is only because we have cultivated and trained our minds and neglected the training of our emotional life. No wonder that it is apt to play us queer tricks.

Feeling, when it is real feeling, is that in us which enables us to grasp the worth of things. Good and evil, beauty and ugliness, significance and value of all kinds are apprehended by feeling, not by thought. Without feeling we could know neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction; nothing would be more worth while to us than anything else. In that case we could not choose to do one thing rather than another; and we could not even think, because we could not choose anything to think about, nor feel that one thought was more significant than another. 'But surely', you say, 'we can think that something is good, without feeling it. We can think that something is worth while doing and do it because we think it is worth while, even when our desires and feelings would prevent us from doing it.' Yes! we can very nearly do that, though even then it is only with the help of a feeling—a feeling of self-respect or reverence for the ideas which guide our judgment. We call that doing our duty because it is our duty. There are occasions when that is

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

necessary; but if it is necessary there is something wrong somewhere. We only do things because they are our duty when we think that something is worth while doing without feeling that it is worth while. And in that case either our feeling is wrong or our thought is wrong. I want to underline the statement that *our thought may be wrong, and our feeling may be right*. In matters of what is good and bad, feeling is the proper guide; and when we fall back on rules, we are falling back really upon a traditional feeling—the feelings of other people, in fact, because we cannot trust our own. But in that case, the sooner we train ourselves to feel properly, the better.

For our feelings may be mistaken, just as our ideas may be. They may deceive us and introduce unreality into our experience. We may feel that a picture is beautiful when it is not. Of course we may think or judge that something is beautiful or good when we don't feel that it is. We may think that Milton's 'Paradise Lost' is a fine poem and not feel that it is anything but tedious and boring. In that case we do not appreciate it and it is mere dishonesty to pretend that we do. It is the things that we really feel, not think worth while that are worth while *for us*, and it is no use trying to substitute our idea for our feeling. Our opinion that things are worth while cannot make them worth while for us if our feelings obstinately refuse to agree. If we are to appreciate anything in the world it must be through our feelings about it. There is no other way. And yet our feelings may de-

ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS

ceive us. We may feel that a man is a rogue without having any reason to think he is. And we may be right, or we may be wrong in our feeling. People often call this *intuition*, which is a bad name for it. But whatever we call it, it is a real source of knowledge, and it may be right or wrong. Notice that. Our intuitions are just as likely to be wrong as our ideas.

But now we must come to the point. We may be real or unreal in our feeling. This is rather a surprising fact, which modern psychology has made absolutely plain. Not only may our feelings be mistaken—as when we feel proud of doing something of which we ought to feel ashamed—but we may be mistaken about our own feelings. Many people think that if you feel something then you feel it, and that's that. Unfortunately it isn't. We may be completely at sea about our feelings. We may not know what we feel, and we may think we feel in one way when we really feel in another. Let me give you some examples.

Any striking individual is apt to make it difficult to know what we feel about him. If you meet someone with a striking personality for the first time and spend an evening in his company, you often ask yourself afterwards, 'Do I like him or not?' and you are honestly unable to say. The same is true of a picture or play which is of an unfamiliar type. Notice that this is not because you have no feeling and are simply indifferent. On the contrary, it is when we are most strongly moved by something or someone striking and outstanding that it is apt to happen. And in the

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

case of the more elaborate emotions, like love for instance, it takes a long time to discover what our real feeling is. Whenever we take our feelings seriously and honestly we discover, I think, that it is difficult to know what we feel.

But also, we may render ourselves incapable of knowing what we feel by suppressing our feelings. The psycho-analysts have made us all aware of that. Their theories may be bad or good, and they often push them to extreme and absurd lengths, but of this main fact, that we can suppress our feelings so that they work in us without our knowing that they are there, there can, it seems to me, be no doubt at all. And we all know it perfectly well. We have all met people who were obviously jealous, whose actions revealed their jealousy, and who would have been honestly indignant if we suggested to them that they were jealous. Similarly, the unconscious hypocrite is a common figure; the man whose passion for power takes the form of unselfishness and benevolence, for example. It is so easy to feel that you are acting out of pure unselfish desire for another person's good, when you really are satisfying an unconscious passion for ordering them about. Of this you can find plenty of examples for yourselves. Obviously, if we are to be real in our feeling we must know what we really feel. Half the difficulty arises from the fact that we don't want to face our real feelings, and to avoid doing so we either refuse to be conscious of them or pretend to ourselves about them. We have an amazing capacity

ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS

for fooling ourselves about our real feelings.

Now we must apply ourselves to the main problem. What are the sources of unreal feeling and how does our feeling become unreal? The answer is quite parallel to the one we gave in the case of thinking. Feeling becomes unreal when it is divorced from contact with the world outside us and shut up within itself. Let me repeat what I said last week. Our real nature consists in our grasp of things outside us. Real thought grasps the nature of that which is not ourselves—the outside world of things and people. So real feeling grasps the value of what is not ourselves, and enjoys it or disapproves it. The moment that feeling ceases to be directed outwards, the moment it ceases to be an appreciation of the thing or the person with which it is connected in fact, it becomes unreal, or, to use a very appropriate term, sentimental. We had better make this clear by means of examples and instances.

When I sleep badly, I am apt to waken in a bad temper. In that case I find that any small and quite innocent action of somebody else that doesn't quite fit in with my wishes makes me feel angry with that person. Afterwards I realize that my anger was unreal; that is to say, it was not really directed against the person for whom I felt it, but only occasioned by him. His action stimulated the feeling in me, but the feeling did not really correspond at all to the action which aroused it. Real anger would mean anger which was really directed towards the person or his

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

action, because his action made anger the proper feeling.

Again, we may compare the feelings that we have in reading two novels, one of which is really a good novel, a work of art, and the other is an exciting sensational story. In the first case we enjoy the novel itself, and the pleasure is a quiet, solid, real pleasure, because it is directed upon the novel and is an appreciation of the goodness of the novel. In the other case it is not the story itself that we enjoy, but the feelings that it arouses or stimulates in us. The feelings are unreal feelings, not because they are not felt, of course (they are apt to be very intense), but because they are not grasping the real value of the story. If our feeling was real we should probably be disgusted or bored. In general, we may say, that excitement is a good test of the unreality of feeling. When anything excites us and stimulates feelings in us, we are not feeling *it*.

We may put the same point in another way if we say that when we enjoy our feelings, we are feeling unreally or sentimentally. When we feel really, we enjoy the thing itself, not the feeling. Similarly, if someone flashes light from a mirror into our eyes we have a sensation of dazzling light, but we don't really see. We can't even see the mirror.

Let us apply this to love, which is the completest and most important of our feelings. I may feel love for someone either really or unreally. My love may be either real or sentimental. What is the difference?

ON BEING REAL IN OUR FEELINGS

To love a person really is to love *him*, and in that case the love is an appreciation of his real worth. Real love grasps the worth and value of its object and loves the other person for himself or herself. Unreal or sentimental love does not. It enjoys the feelings which the other person arouses or stimulates, and is not concerned with the real worth, the real goodness of its object. We sometimes talk of a person being in love with love. That is precisely what I mean by unreal or sentimental love.

Perhaps these examples are sufficient to make the main point clear. When we feel in an unreal way, our feelings are turned in upon themselves. We enjoy or dislike our feelings, not the object or person who arouses them in us. When we feel in a real way, it is the object or the person that we realize and appreciate. So I repeat—feeling is unreal when it is divorced from the world outside us and turned in upon itself.

It is possible, just as in the case of thinking, to make an ideal of unreality. We may make feeling an end in itself, and set out to realize all the possibilities of feeling, to experience feeling for its own sake. That is the ideal of Epicureanism, and though most of us profess to think that it is disreputable, there is a great deal of it about in practice. But there is one aspect of it which is perfectly respectable, the aspect of feeling which is concerned with art—with painting and music and poetry and novels and so on. There we think that it is not merely proper, but the right thing to cultivate feelings which are divorced from reality, and to allow

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

ourselves the luxury of feeling in a way which we would strenuously resist in real life. To do this is mischievous. It is an indulgence in unreality. It is definitely sentimental and encourages sentimentality.

At least half the novels we read and nearly all the films we see are deliberately meant to arouse unreal feelings. And therefore they are thoroughly demoralizing. Books, plays and films which are censored are nearly always much less dangerous, because even if they are wrong in their feelings they are usually real. And it is far better to be real in our feelings than to be right.

That brings me to my last point. Because unreal feeling is divorced from experience it cannot be tested against experience and in experience. Feeling which is suppressed or repressed is made unreal, because it is not allowed to express itself in action. This is the second great source of unreality in us and our world. And the practical upshot is quite simple. If we are to be real in our feelings we must act upon them and trust them as guides of our conduct. Then, if they are wrong, we shall discover that they are wrong and be able to put them right. But we refuse, on the whole, to believe in feelings. And therefore, though we think it wrong to tell lies—that is, to express a thought which we don't really think, we often think it right and virtuous to express a feeling that we don't feel. It is not right; it is completely demoralizing.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

VI

ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

TO-NIGHT OUR business is to summarize our whole discussion of Reality, and to bring it to its point of concentration, from which we may go on to the discussion of Freedom. So far we have been gathering material, going from one point to another. Now we have to focus the picture as a whole; and the focus of all unreality is an unreal person. So I propose to talk to you about unreal people.

First of all, let me remind you of the obviously unreal people and the obviously real people whom you must have met. There are, of course, degrees of unreality in people. We are all more or less unreal ourselves, and so we don't notice the degrees of reality and unreality with which we are familiar. But when we meet people who are unusually real or unusually unreal we notice it at once, and so we can get our impression of what unreal people and real people are like from the extreme cases, and by comparing them we can appreciate the difference. Then, with the impression clear in our minds, we can go on to try to define it and to discover what gives rise to the un-

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

reality of people. But let me give you a preliminary word of warning. We must not confuse unreality and queerness. Queer people are simply people who are obviously unlike ourselves, who do not conform to our ordinary standards of behaviour in one way or another. Now people who are obviously unreal will be queer people; but then so will people who are obviously and outstandingly real. A person may be queer and unusual either because he is above the average or below it. We would expect a very real person to be very queer by all our ordinary standards.

Let me try to describe what I mean by a very real person, while you try to think of someone you have met who fits the description more or less well. When I meet the kind of person who is exceptionally real for me, I recognize him because there is no getting over the fact that he is there. He can't be overlooked, even when he says nothing and does nothing. He is emphatically *there*. More than that, he is all there—not in the ordinary sense, but literally. There is a wholeness and completeness about him that I sense in some strange way. And then, he is very much himself. I don't want to ask what he is or does, because he isn't so much a man with a job, a man that fits tidily away into a socket in the ordinary scheme of things. He isn't a type, or an embodied job, or a wheel in a machine, but very much, and first and foremost, a human being—very much himself. There is always a curious simplicity and definiteness about him—a quietness which is sure of itself. Not the quietness of

ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

what is dead, but the quietness of a steady flame. Yes! that is quite a good way to put it. A very real person seems to me to have a sort of flame in him that shines through and makes him transparent. He isn't necessarily brilliant intellectually or emotionally powerful. He may or may not be; but if he is clever, you hardly notice it; it is so simple; indeed you notice *him* so much more than his qualities. He is significant, and significant just by being himself, not through any particular qualities or peculiarities that he possesses. And he is significant because he is vital. Yet the vitality is not necessarily a fullness of physical activity, or even physical strength; because it shows equally well, perhaps even better, in repose. It is rather a fullness of life, a completeness of life, an inherent livingness about him. Then I know that I am dealing with a real person.

On the other hand, the unreal person, if he is unusually unreal, is the very opposite of this. He is apt to be overlooked in company, as if he wasn't there. Often, because of this, he tends to chatter a lot and thrust himself forward, exhibiting great energy; but you feel that the energy is somehow worked up and galvanized into action, it isn't the spontaneous flowing out of a fund of life in the man. For all his activity he doesn't seem to get anywhere, and all his talking only makes him a bore. He is in fact inwardly rather dead and lives on other people, reacting to them, stimulated into self-assertion by them. I don't think he ever gives me the impression

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of quietness or repose. He is often, I find, highly intellectual, but when I talk with him, for all his brilliance he always seems to be somehow up in the air, out of touch with concrete experience. He is just as often passionate in his feelings, and yet the passion seems somehow to be unnecessary or out of proportion. 'What's all the fuss about?' I find myself asking. 'Where does it all come to earth?' And I find that all my efforts to get into real touch with the man lead to nothing. There seems to be nothing behind his opinions and his feelings. And he is almost always completely and thoroughly respectable. He hasn't any real opinions of his own; they are all ordinary opinions, or at least opinions that come out of books or out of newspapers, not out of his own experience of life. And his feelings are the same. They are orthodox feelings, or at least they are feelings that one has met elsewhere and recognizes as old friends. There is a staleness and dullness about them, as if the spirit of the man wasn't in them. If a person like that comes into a company where a jolly interchange of real conversation and real feeling has been going on, it dries up at once and the conversation becomes trivial and commonplace. He is somehow flat and unsolid, like people on the screen of the cinema, unsubstantial and shadowy; and in his presence everything seems to go flat and lose its substance. When he is energetic he isn't vital, but 'full of sound and fury, signifying nothing'. And when he is silent, he isn't reposeful, but rather sulky or vacant. That is the kind of impression

ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

that unreal people have on my mind. They are vague and shadowy and indefinite, like ghosts, when you get behind their defences. All the definiteness and precision and orderliness that they have is drilled into them or put into them from outside. It doesn't grow out from inside. There is the same kind of difference between the real person and the unreal person as there is between a naturally beautiful woman and one who is well made-up.

Now, with this contrast in our minds, let us ask what it is that makes people unreal, and turns them into ghosts and echoes. There are two parts to the answer. The first part concerns their relation to the world outside them, and particularly to other persons. Unreal people are egocentric. They are out of touch with the world outside them and turned in upon themselves, and because of that they are highly self-conscious. Their interest is really in themselves and not in the world outside them. They do not love beautiful things, for example; they love to possess them, to have them for themselves. What they demand of the outside world is that it should stimulate them and be agreeable to them and satisfy them. They want it to stimulate and maintain them, to contribute to their enjoyment and self-satisfaction. They are not interested in other people; they want other people to minister to their self-esteem, to recognize them, think highly of them, respect them and love them. In all their thoughts and feelings and behaviour they themselves are the centre round which

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

the world revolves, and so they never want to get into touch with what is not themselves in its reality, but only in so far as it can be made to contribute to their own precious selves. So their consciousness is centred in themselves and shut in upon themselves, and shut off from the significance of what is not themselves.

I want you to notice particularly that this unreality of people is quite compatible with what is ordinarily called unselfishness. One of the commonest ways of being self-centred is to put other people in your debt by doing things for them. Such unselfishness is really a way of enhancing one's own sense of importance and of binding other people to one by bonds of gratitude. By being good and unselfish we can feel good and important and kind, and we can make other people feel how good and kind we are. And still we are the centre of the picture. Any of you who have lived with people who insist upon serving you and subordinating themselves to you and doing things for you must know from experience, perhaps from bitter experience, how such a person can sap your strength and vitality and make life a misery. And the underlying reason of this is that they are interested not in you, but in themselves doing things for you. You find that they just don't want the real you, they only want you there in order to provide them with constant opportunities for unselfishness. Constantly to defer to another person's wishes is a subtle way of throwing all the responsibility upon him and becoming dependent

ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

on him. If you do that you don't live by your own life, but by other people's, and so you drain their vitality and live on them like a vampire. No! very selfless people are usually very unreal people, however 'good' they may appear to be. They are turned in upon themselves, interested in themselves in a queer inverted way.

Another important point in this connection is that the more people are turned in upon themselves, the less they are themselves. This comes out in a variety of ways. For instance, a person who is not interested in things for themselves, but only as ministering to him, can't think for himself. If you are to think about anything and know it for yourself, you must be interested, not in yourself, but in it. If you are not, then you will be dependent for your knowledge and your opinions and beliefs upon other people's thinking. You will have no real opinion of your own; only borrowed ones. So with your feelings. If your interest is turned in upon yourself, you will be interested in your feelings, of course; but they won't be really yours; because you can't have feelings about things you are not interested in for themselves. You will feel about things, then, not for yourself, but as other people feel—imitatively, and your feelings will not be really yours. More generally this loss of selfhood shows itself in the curious but comprehensible fact that the more self-conscious we become, the more we try to subordinate other people and things to ourselves, the more dependent we become on them, and lose our

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

own independence and reality. This is quite natural, because if I need other people to make me feel that I am somebody, then I am dependent on them for my own significance. In their absence I am just annihilated, I am nothing in myself, completely unreal in myself. Whereas if I am really occupied with what is not myself and am not self-conscious, I am not dependent on them for the stimulation of my thoughts and my feelings. I retain my independence and my reality, because I live from within outwards. This is merely a restatement of something I have said twice before in other talks, that the real nature of human beings consists in their capacity to live outside themselves. Turn that outgoing consciousness back upon itself and a person loses his real nature and becomes unreal. That, then, is the first part of the answer. Unreal people are people who are turned back upon themselves.

The second part of the answer is this. The unreality of people is the result of disunity within them; in particular the disunity between thought and feeling. If there is a clash between what we feel and what we think real and significant then a strain is set up within us between the two sides of our nature, and our own reality is destroyed. The harmony of thought and emotion is the inner condition of the reality of persons. If, for instance, we want something very much which we think is bad, then the conflict between our desire and our judgment paralyses our freedom of action. If we do what we want to do when

ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

we think we ought not to do it, we are made unreal, because half of our nature repudiates the action. Equally if we do what we think is right without feeling that it is right, our reality is destroyed. That is why people who continually do their duty in defiance of their desire are such unreal people. Such pandering to thought in defiance of feeling is humanly unreal. We often say of such persons—and rightly—that they are not human. Their humanity is not real humanity.

The effect of such a struggle between thought and feeling is that thought becomes abstract and formal, while feeling becomes sentimental. Take thought first. If it is at variance with feeling it must determine for itself what is significant and good. Now that is the business of feeling; and left to itself thought can only accept the opinions of others about what is valuable. It *assumes* that certain things are good and bad, significant and unimportant; it doesn't decide for itself, because it can't. And therefore, in general, thought divorced from feeling must rely on tradition, that is to say on somebody else's feeling in the long run. It has to fall back on external authority. If I do this, if I think that something is good or true or beautiful or important because somebody else thinks so or feels so, then I do not really think it. Any significance or truth my thought may have is not mine but somebody else's. My reality does not go into my thought at all. I am dependent on other people. My thinking is abstract, mechanical and formal, dependent on other

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

people's reality. I become a mere mould into which opinions are run. My mind may be a marvellously perfect machine for thinking, but it doesn't work for *me*. Somebody else has to supply the material for me to think about. That is the effect of divorcing thought from feeling. We become unreal in our thinking.

Similarly with feeling divorced from thought. It becomes sentimental. If my feeling is at variance with my thinking, then my thought cannot supply me with real things to feel about. It is thinking that decides what things are and how they are, and if feeling tries to do this for itself it again must appeal for outside help. It will be at the mercy of tradition. I shall feel angry when I am supposed to feel angry, approve things that are usually approved and never really feel anything for myself. So I shall become unreal in my feelings, which is sentimentality. My own feelings will never determine their proper relations to the things I experience. They will not really be mine. One feels that often after a visit to the cinema. One has feelings stimulated in one which one repudiates afterwards. 'How could I have enjoyed that trash?' we find ourselves saying. And the proper answer is, 'I didn't, I only thought I did. If I had been thinking what it all really meant I should have loathed it.'

Lastly, these two causes of unreality in people, being turned in on themselves and being out of harmony in themselves, are closely related. It is in the ordinary experience of sense-perception that thought and feeling meet and mingle. It is in seeing things

ABOUT UNREAL PEOPLE

and handling them and doing things with them that we are in touch with them. The outer world enters into us through the gateways of the senses, and through the same gateways thought and feeling pass out to grasp the outer world. So long as that commerce is going on we are not turned in on ourselves, and thought and feeling are fused. In the activity of the senses we at once and immediately enjoy and know what is not ourselves. If we try to see things without enjoying them or feeling about them they are robbed of their significance for us. It is a mistake to think that that is the way to be unbiased or unprejudiced. To be indifferent to the things you see and think about is to be desperately biased and prejudiced in favour of unreality. And if that co-operation, that fusion of thought and feeling in immediate sensuous commerce with the external world is interrupted, two things happen: we are cut off from direct contact with what is not ourselves, and thought and feeling fall apart and cease to work together. Thought and feeling can only be unified if both are directed outwards upon the world.

To sum up, then. People become unreal when their thoughts and feelings are at variance, so that they are out of tune in their inner life; and that happens because they are turned in on themselves and shut off from immediate and direct contact with the world outside them. Losing the outside world they lose themselves; their inner life dies and goes into dissolution, and they become ghosts and echoes, the

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

slaves of tradition and orthodoxy. To be real is to live by the reality that is in you, and from within outwards. It is to be yourself. And we can only be ourselves for other people. Why so? Because to be yourself for yourself is to be turned in upon yourself and so to start on the path that leads to the unreality of spiritual dissolution.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

VII

ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY BEING FREE

WE HAVE done with our discussion of Reality, and this is the first of six talks on freedom. But the two parts of the course are not independent. Freedom and Reality are very closely bound up together. I should like therefore to begin the discussion of freedom by stressing and underlining a point that will only gradually become clear as we proceed. *Only real people can be free.* We are bound, determined and unfree in proportion as we are ourselves unreal.

Why do I stress this? Because it is the fundamental condition of what I want to say about human freedom and about morality. In spite of all that timid moralists have said, a man is free only when he does exactly what he wants to do, without let or hindrance. And that statement admits of no qualification. To act freely is to act without restraint, quite spontaneously. And therefore I want you to have in your minds from the beginning the other side of this—that only a real person *can* act freely. This is not a qualification; for I do not say that only a real person *ought* to act freely or ought to be *allowed* to act freely; I say that only a

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

real person *can*. Unreal people often think they are doing what they want to do; but in fact they never are; they simply *can't*. In the absence of personal reality freedom is just impossible.

Now let us apply ourselves to the simple question that is before us to-night. What do we mean by being free? When we say that we are 'free' to do something; when we say that an Englishman is a free man in a free country; when we say that the wild animals 'roam freely in their native wilds', what is the idea which we express in the word 'free'? The simplest answer, and perhaps the best one, is that we mean the opposite of bound or constrained or caged or enslaved. When anything is bound, it is in the power of something else. A prisoner in a prison is not free because he is prevented from going out and must stay where he is whether he wants to or not. He is in someone else's power, and his actions are under someone else's control. For the same reason we say that a slave is not free. His actions are under the control of someone else; he is in the power of his master. An animal in a cage is not free for the same reason; it is in the power and under the control of someone else. Scientists talk of matter falling freely through space. Why 'freely'? Because in empty space a body would not be controlled by anything outside itself; there would be nothing compelling it to move in any particular direction, so that it would not be under constraint.

When we say then that a man is free, we mean that he is not under constraint, he is in nobody's power,

ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY BEING FREE

no one else controls his actions or dictates his conduct. He does as he pleases, goes and comes as he pleases, works or not as he pleases and so on. He can sing with the miller:

*'I care for nobody, no not I,
And nobody cares for me.'*

That sounds dangerous and wrong already, doesn't it? Never mind; let us get at it in another way. We shall notice first that freedom is an idea that is concerned with action. To be free means not to be under constraint. Now if you don't want to do anything—if you are sound asleep, for instance—there is no sense in saying you are free or not free. Unless, of course, you mean that if you wanted to do something, you would be free or not free to do it. Freedom means freedom to do something. That is why we cannot think that material objects are free. They don't do things; they are always used. Philosophers call this being 'determined'. A chair only gets from one place to another by being pushed or carried or moved somehow by something else. It is never free, always determined. Its movements are all caused by something else. Yet when, as scientists, we think of matter having energy in it, so that it moves by itself, we find ourselves saying that it moves freely. Then we are thinking that it is the nature of things to move; and that a stone naturally falls to the ground, unless something else prevents it from falling. *Then* we shall say, when we release the stone, that it is *free* to fall. That is

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

to say, it does fall, because it is its nature to fall, and therefore it *will* fall if nothing prevents it.

Now this, I think, is the important point. Even a stone has its freedom. That is to say, if it is let alone and not interfered with by anything else, it will naturally do something; it will fall. It will fall of itself, without being pushed or helped or carried. Its falling will express its own nature. It is the nature of material objects to fall—we used to say ‘to gravitate’ before Einstein pointed out to us that we didn’t know what that meant, and Eddington informed us that ‘the earth goes where it pleases’. And whenever a thing does of itself what it is its own nature to do, we say that it acts freely. Or to put it a little differently, everything has its own nature, and when it expresses its own nature in action, it is free or acts freely. When anything acts of itself, or ‘off its own bat’, it acts freely. To be free, then, is to express one’s own nature in action.

The most positive way of expressing this is to say that free action is spontaneous action, or that freedom is spontaneity. When we act freely the action is spontaneous; it expresses us and nothing but us; it is unconstrained. The free action flows from our own nature. An animal in a cage is not free, because he wouldn’t go into a cage and stay there spontaneously. It isn’t his nature. You can only tell what his nature is by letting him act spontaneously, without restraint. Then he will be himself, or behave naturally. It is the same with ourselves. We are free when we act spon-

ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY BEING FREE

taneously, when we are ourselves, when we express our own inner selves by behaving naturally. And you will see that we can now say quite simply that it is the nature of anything to be free; since to be free is simply to express its own nature without let or hindrance.

Suppose now that you say to me, 'You can't have people doing just as they please, being quite natural, and expressing themselves all over the place. Let's have liberty, of course, but not license.' I can only say that you are quite off the rails. If people are not to be free, not to be natural, not to express themselves, then what in heaven's name are they to be or do or express? 'But this is pure anarchy,' you will say. Have you, then, forgotten already what I said to start with, that only a real person can be free? The very point of that lies here, and the explanation lies in our discussions of reality. Only a real person can express his own nature and be himself, and therefore only a real person can ever do as he pleases.

Let me repeat the important point of that discussion about our own reality. Only human beings are capable of unreality. Other forms of being always express their own nature and behave in accordance with their own nature. We, on the contrary, can be unreal. We can think without really thinking; we can feel without really feeling, and so we can do things without really doing them. Whenever there is unreality in us, we are not really ourselves, and in our behaviour our own reality, our own nature is not expressed. Then we are not free. We saw, too, that

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

human nature consisted in our capacity to live outside of ourselves, in contact with and immersed in the reality of the outside world. Only behaviour which expresses this capacity expresses ourselves. If our feelings are not real, that is to say, in proper touch with the world outside, then the actions to which they give rise will not really be free, though we may think they are. They will not really be spontaneous. That is why I say that a person who is unreal in his thinking or in his feeling *cannot* be spontaneous, and therefore *cannot* do as he pleases. For this reason I have no qualms at all about saying that we ought to act freely, to be natural, to express ourselves, to do what we want to do, without restraint or hindrance; and you can see also why I say it without qualification.

I rather suspect that some of you will feel that I am not being quite straightforward about this. I can only assure you that I am, and that I am not reintroducing the old qualifications of freedom in a new way. But I shall have to wait for future talks to make that clear. For the moment, let me point out another consequence of the peculiar nature of human beings, namely, that our freedom depends upon inner conditions. A man may be unfree because he is in somebody else's power, or because he hasn't the means to do what he wants to do, or for other external reasons, but you might remove all these external hindrances; and still find that he wasn't free. Why? Because he was not free in himself. Look at one or two instances.

It is obviously untrue to say that we are free to do

ABOUT WHAT WE MEAN BY BEING FREE

as we please, if we don't know what we want to do. And all of us often find it very difficult to know what we want to do. Again, even if we know what we want to do, we may be afraid to do it, and our fear may be a constraint *within* us. So long as the fear is there, we can't act freely. Even if we do what we want to do, we shall have to force ourselves to do it, and then we shall not be doing it spontaneously. Strictly, we shall not be doing what we want to do, since our fear is in itself the indication that we don't altogether want to do it. Or again, if we are self-conscious in company, if we can't completely trust the people we are with, we can't act freely, we can't be spontaneous, we can't be ourselves. We have to confess to constraint; we have to watch our words and our actions in case they should be used against us. Freedom is destroyed. Under such conditions we cannot do as we please. Even if we are real ourselves? Yes, even then. For even a real person cannot be free in the face of unreal persons. He may be free in himself, but he cannot express his freedom freely. So I conclude with a point which I have mentioned before, but have not yet had time to develop. Human freedom demands not merely free people, but the relationship of free people. Its final basis lies in real friendship. All reality, that is to say, all significance converges upon friendship, upon the real relationship of one person with another independently real person. So that if we want an example of what it means to be free, what it feels like in experience, as it were, we must think of the

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

occasions on which we have found ourselves completely spontaneous and unconstrained in the company of a friend. If you think of that kind of experience, you will understand, I think, whether you agree or not, what I mean by saying that our freedom realizes itself in and through friendship. It is only in friendship that we ever find ourselves completely ourselves and so completely free. We can say what we please and do what we please without restraint in ourselves or outside ourselves. And you will also understand the connection between reality and freedom. For in such a flowering of friendship we find the two things indissolubly joined. We are completely ourselves and completely free; and our reality and our freedom are two sides of the same penny.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

VIII

ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM

FREEDOM, we have found, is the absence of restraint upon spontaneity of action. Anything is free when it acts spontaneously. To act spontaneously is to act from oneself, from within outwards, so that the action expresses the agent and has its source wholly and simply in the agent. We saw also what this implies; that everything has a nature of its own, which nature is really its capacity for behaving in a way peculiar to itself. Leave it alone and it will do something; and what it does will be the expression of what it is. On the other hand, there are always many ways in which things can be made to behave unnaturally. A stone falls freely to the ground; it doesn't rise freely from the ground; but it can be thrown upwards. Then it does not express its own nature, it is mastered by an external force and constrained to behave in a way which is unnatural to it. Thus when we say that anything acts freely, we mean that it expresses its own proper nature in action. When we say that anything is free, we mean that it is in a position to express its own nature in action without hindrance.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

Now we mean precisely the same when we talk about human freedom. A man acts freely when he is unconstrained, when the action expresses his own nature and arises spontaneously out of his own nature. Is there then no difference between human freedom and the freedom of animals or of material bodies like the sun and the stars? Of course there is; but that is because different things have different natures and each is free only in expressing *its own* nature. Different kinds of freedom depend upon different kinds of nature. I want to-night to draw your attention to three general types of nature—material nature, living nature and human nature—in order to define the three different types of freedom to which each gives rise. And from the beginning we had better notice that these three natures are not just different, even though they are essentially different. A human being is also an animal and also a material body. A plant or animal is also a material body. We shall not then be surprised to find that the three types of freedom have the same kind of relation to one another, that human freedom is also organic freedom, and also material freedom.

We turn first, then, to consider the nature of matter, or to put it more concretely and more properly, the nature of material bodies. By their nature I mean the character which they express in free activity. How does a material body behave? It behaves *mechanically*. What does this mean? It means, fundamentally, that its behaviour is absolutely uni-

ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM

form. It always does the same thing in the same circumstances. It is completely consistent. When scientists talk about the uniformity of nature that is what they mean. Once you have noticed that one piece of sodium dropped into water catches fire and rushes about the surface of the water till it is consumed, you know that any piece of sodium will always do that if you drop it into water. Material bodies go on repeating and repeating themselves *ad infinitum*. Each has its own little shibboleth which is never varied and which is its only answer to every question. As a result, we can discover beforehand what any material body will do under given circumstances and so we can predict its behaviour with complete accuracy. The formula which expresses the constant behaviour of material bodies and so enables us to predict their future behaviour is what we call a law of nature. So we can say that matter obeys laws. It is its nature to obey laws, and in obeying the law of its own nature it acts with complete freedom. Indeed, to say that matter is always determined is another way of saying that it is free in obeying a fixed law. It is its own nature that is expressed in the uniformity of its own mechanical behaviour.

That, then, is the nature of material bodies expressed in the simplest way and therefore the nature of material freedom. Matter expresses its own nature and so acts freely or spontaneously in acting mechanically or uniformly, in obeying the laws of nature, that is to say, the laws of its own material nature, with com-

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

plete consistency and unerring precision.

Next we must consider the nature of living things, and their freedom. The field of life is a very varied one, beginning with tiny organisms which are hardly distinguishable from bits of dead matter, and rising stage by stage to immensely complex organisms like the higher mammals, elephants and horses and apes. We divide it roughly into two main sections, plant-life and animal-life, assuming, probably rightly, that animal life involves consciousness and that plant life does not. In face of this vast variety of the forms of life, how can we answer, simply, the question, 'What is the general nature which is peculiar to living organisms?' The very variety of life suggests the answer, that the nature of life consists in its capacity for variation. Unlike material bodies, living bodies do not always behave in the same way in the same circumstances. It belongs to their nature to vary.

The root fact about whatever is alive is that it grows. Now growth is simply variation in a definite direction, which belongs to the nature of the individual organism. The same organism is first a seed and then a sapling and then a full-grown tree; or first an egg, then a chicken and then a full-grown hen. Every living being has its own life-cycle, a definite cycle of spontaneous variation through which it expresses its own nature. If it did not vary in this definite, cyclic way it would just not be alive.

Now when we consider the spontaneous variation which we call the growth of an organism—either

ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM

plant or animal—we find that it consists in a harmonious interchange and interplay between the living thing and its environment. The environment stimulates the living thing, and its life or behaviour consists in its response to the stimulus. Plants respond to the stimulus of light, for example. If you grow a plant in a dark cellar with a small window high up, the plant will respond by growing tall and spindly in an effort to reach the light. Its behaviour will vary as the stimulus varies. It will vary in an effort to adapt itself to its environment, to fit in with the conditions under which it grows. If it fails to adapt itself, it dies before its time, that is to say, before it has realized its own nature in the completion of its life cycle. Thus we see that there is what we can only call failure in the organic world; failure in complete realization of organic nature. And that failure is a failure of the particular organism to adapt itself to its environment.

But there is another aspect of life which is essential to the nature of living organisms and which takes us immediately beyond the individual living creature—the capacity to reproduce their own kind. At first sight it would seem that this capacity for self-propagation simply meant that the life-cycle of an organism repeated itself *ad infinitum* in the constant succession of generations. But that is not so. In reproduction the living creature expresses the fundamental character of life—its capacity for variation in a definite direction. The offspring are not mere reproductions of the parent—but reproductions with variation. There is

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

thus a growth or development of life through the generations, to which we give the name of evolution. This is the larger aspect of the nature of living things. As in the case of the individual, the larger evolutionary nature of life consists in spontaneous variation through response to stimulus in an effort of living creatures to adapt themselves to an increasingly complex environment. Why increasingly complex? Because it is the nature of living creatures to multiply, when they are free to do so (note the term 'free' in this connection, for it is another good example of what we mean by 'freedom') and the more animals or plants there are in the same stretch of country, the more complex for each of them the environment becomes. But there is one notable difference between this larger aspect of life and the life of the individual. Evolution escapes from the finality that death imposes on the spontaneous variation of the individual. The individual by his efforts to adapt himself contributes his little bit to the accomplishment of an increasing purpose and hands the torch of life on to the next generation. So the individual organism is the servant of a great purpose—the purpose of life. And the purpose of life is what we call progress, the realization, age after age, of an increasing complexity of organization; the building up of a vast community of life in the most varied forms, each form depending on all the others, each taking its place in the whole and contributing its share to the whole, and each through its own efforts contributing to the further

ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM

progress of the whole towards an end which is hidden in the mists of the infinite future. That is the nature of living beings, seen in its full scope.

This is all rather complicated. But we need not worry about the complications. What I should like you to remember is the ideas that are bound up with our consideration of the nature of living beings; the ideas of growth, development and evolution; the idea of adaptation to environment, of fitting in to one's place in a complex organization or community; the ideas of progress and purpose, of the end to which the whole creation moves; the idea of the service of the species and its development. These are all ideas which express the nature of living beings, of plants and animals. And thus the freedom of living creatures—what we may call organic freedom—is the freedom to realize that nature to the full, without constraint or hindrance. Give a living being the conditions under which it can live freely and naturally and it will respond by adapting itself to the demands of life, by behaving in a way that furthers the development of life, the progress of the species, by acting spontaneously and naturally as a member of the great community of life. The life-force which it serves, the evolutionary drive which it expresses in its spontaneous behaviour is its own nature, and in following its own nature it is free.

Now we come to the third type of nature and its proper freedom—I mean human nature, the nature of persons. We have already dealt with this in some

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of the talks about reality and we shall be dealing with it in other aspects in the succeeding talks. For the moment I only want to stress its difference from the other two types of nature. Our nature is not the nature of material objects; it does not express itself in spontaneous uniformity or obedience to law. Neither is it the nature of living beings; it does not express itself in spontaneous variation, in adaptation to environment, in the service of the purposes of life. How then does it express itself? Perhaps you will allow me for this once to use a convenient technical term, if I go on to explain it. *Personal reality expresses itself in spontaneous objectivity*. What do I mean by objectivity? I mean what I have repeatedly expressed by saying that it is our nature to apprehend and enjoy a world that is outside ourselves, to live in communion with a world which is independent of us. We have the capacity to know other things and other people and to enjoy them. And when we are completely ourselves we live by that knowledge and appreciation of what is not ourselves, and so in communion with other beings. That is what I term our objectivity, and it is the essence of our human nature. When we really think, we think in terms of something real outside ourselves; when we really feel, we feel in terms of something real outside ourselves; and when we really act, we act objectively, that is, in terms of the world of things and people that is not us. When we think, we think about something or someone, we don't merely have ideas in our minds; when we feel—when we

ON THREE KINDS OF FREEDOM

hate, for example—we don't merely have a feeling of hatred, we hate somebody or something. Our consciousness always goes beyond ourselves and grapples with what is not ourselves. So that we can only express our real nature by behaving in terms of other things and other persons.

How can we put this more concretely? It is, in fact, so simple and so commonplace that it is very difficult to express it at all. I might say that human nature is rational, but that would stress thought too much; and if I said that it is essentially religious, which is perhaps the profoundest thing about it, you would almost certainly misunderstand me. If I said that we are all, in our proper nature artists, you would be inclined to laugh, I imagine, though I think that it would be a true statement. I had better leave these general terms aside and say simply that human nature expresses itself most concretely and completely in friendship. Think of two intimate friends on holiday together and completely at home with one another. How does that bring out the peculiar nature of human beings? Well! they know each other and love each other. So they can think and feel for one another. Each is the object of the other's thought and affection. They each think and feel in terms of the other. And they behave in terms of one another. They make plans together and co-operate and share their enjoyments and their thoughts. So they are free—they think freely and feel freely and act freely—in one another's company. That capacity to live in terms of

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

the other, and so of what is not ourselves, to live in others and through others and for others, is the unique property of human beings.

Because, therefore, the freedom of anything is its ability to express its own nature to the full without constraint, human freedom is the ability to express this peculiar property which belongs only to human beings—the ability to live spontaneously (that is, from themselves) in terms of the other (that is, for and in and by what is not themselves). Only when we live in this way can we be free; for only then do we express our own nature in action. And this freedom is moral freedom. What that means, and particularly what it does not mean, it will be the business of the remaining talks to disentangle.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

IX

MECHANICAL MORALITY

LAST WEEK we discussed three types of freedom which belong to three types of nature—material nature, living nature and human nature. I must now explain the reason for undertaking that discussion.

Our main object is to decide upon the nature of human freedom. Before we can answer the question ‘How can we be free?’ we must first be clear about what our own freedom is. It is important that we should not confuse human freedom with either of the other two types of freedom. If we do we shall run into difficulties, not merely theoretical difficulties, but very real practical ones. In this talk I want to show you the result of thinking about our own freedom as if it were the freedom of matter.

Freedom is very closely bound up with morality. Why so? Because, as we discovered earlier, to be free is to act in a way that expresses one’s own essential nature. Now any system of morality says in effect to us, ‘This is how to be a perfect human being.’ Our idea of morality is simply our idea of the kind of behaviour that makes a man a good man. And a

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

good man is a proper human being, one who realizes in his behaviour the true nature of human life in the circumstances in which he finds himself. To be a good human being is to realize true human nature in oneself; that is to say, to be really human in one's way of living. But that is the same thing as being free. Anything is free when it realizes its own proper nature spontaneously in its behaviour. It follows that, for us, to be free and to be moral mean the same thing in the long run. But I am very much afraid that some of you will run off with the idea that that settles the question. 'If we want to be free, then we must be moral, strictly moral, in our behaviour. Well, that's simple. We all know what that means; and whether we agree or not we know what the lecturer is after.' That is what I am afraid many of you will say at this point, some with a sigh of relief and some with a feeling that you have been let down. So I am in haste to add a question, a really serious question, which puts a new face on the matter. 'Are you sure that you know what good behaviour is? Do you think that our current ideas of morality are true?' We are all so ready to assume that we know how people—particularly other people—ought to behave; and I am quite sure that we don't. A morality, a set of moral ideas, may be wrong and false. Our current morality may quite well be a false morality. So I make this point. Instead of saying that any freedom is bad which is against morality, we ought to say that any morality which is against freedom is a bad morality. Most

MECHANICAL MORALITY

people, I think, want to judge freedom by their ideas of good behaviour. I want to judge our moral ideas by my knowledge of human freedom. Any moral rule which limits real human freedom is a bad rule, no matter how many people believe in it. Freedom is the criterion of good conduct.

But now, if our system of morality is based upon a false notion of human freedom it will be a false morality; and that brings us to the main subject of this talk. If we mistake human freedom for material freedom we shall get a false morality, and it will be false because it is mechanical, because it conceives human nature on the analogy of matter. So I want to talk to you about the system of mechanical morality and to show you how it arises.

Last week we discussed the nature of matter and the material freedom which arises from it. It is the nature of material bodies to act uniformly, with unvarying consistency, in obedience to fixed laws which we call the laws of nature. A material body acts mechanically; that is to say, it always behaves in the same way under the same conditions. So the freedom of matter, the spontaneous expression of its material nature, is freedom in obedience to law. Now it is very simple to take this idea of freedom and to apply it to the behaviour of human beings. If we do, then we shall find ourselves saying, 'True human freedom consists in obedience to law'. As soon as we do that we have laid the foundations of a false morality; because another way of putting the same thing would be to

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

say, 'Good behaviour consists in obedience to the moral law.' Any morality which talks of human behaviour in terms of obedience to law is a false morality. It is false because it is mechanical, because it thinks about human behaviour in terms, not of human nature, but of the nature of matter.

We must try to get quite clear what this means. We often hear people talking about 'obeying the moral law' as if that meant being good or being moral. I am saying that this is a false idea of morality. There is no such thing as a moral law, and the idea of obedience has no place in morality. Take the last point first. So far as my behaviour consists in obedience, I am not free; I am in fact a slave to whomever and whatever I obey. Someone or something, not myself, decides what I shall do, and I do it because it has been so decided. In that case I cannot be responsible for my behaviour. It isn't really mine. I am merely an instrument of someone else's purpose. That is why slavery, in all its forms, is immoral. A slave is in the position of having to do what he is told. He must not think for himself or feel for himself, and so he cannot decide for himself what he ought to do. His master does that for him. But that deprives him of all responsibility. He is not allowed to be real, and his actions are not really his. Suppose, then, that his master commands him to do something wrong—to steal, for example. Can he do it and then say that he is not responsible? Of course not! Because it is necessary that a man should be responsible for his

MECHANICAL MORALITY

own actions; and therefore he must be free to decide for himself what he shall do. That is why morality cannot consist in obedience. To obey is to try to throw the responsibility for our actions on someone else; and that is to deny our own humanity.

But equally, the idea of morality is inconsistent with the idea of law. The root idea of law is consistency and uniformity. Everybody must do the same thing in the same circumstances. If our activities were governed by law they would be invariable, always the same; and such activities would of course be mechanical. If there were such a thing as a moral law then a perfectly good man would be an automaton, a mere robot, with no human freedom at all. The more mechanical life becomes, the more it is organized by law, the less human it is. To be moral means to be as completely human as we can be; and our human nature is, as we have seen, our capacity to think really and feel really for ourselves, and to act accordingly. The more our actions are governed by laws, the less freely we can act, the less room there is for us to think and feel really and so be ourselves. The more law there is in our lives, the less morality there is. That is why I insist that the morality of obedience and law is a false morality, a mechanical morality.

How does it come about, then, that so many people talk about morality as if it consisted in obeying a moral law? I will give you two answers: the first a very plain practical one; the second a deeper and more theoretical one.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

If everybody else acted in obedience to a fixed law, then they would act with uniform consistency. We should then know what everybody would do in all circumstances. We could tell beforehand what to expect of them and we should never be let down. We could lay our own plans with complete safety and know that nobody would upset them by doing something unexpected. And that would be so much simpler and more satisfactory for us. So we want everybody to be consistent. We want them to recognize all sorts of fixed duties, to pledge themselves to do things in a way that will bind them for the future. We even go so far as to require people to promise that they will love and honour us all their lives. Why? So that we can be secure, and certain of the future, and lay our own plans for the future with safety. The real reason for wanting people to be consistent is just that we may be able to count on them, to calculate their behaviour beforehand. That is why we tell people that there is a moral law and they ought to obey it. It is really for our own supposed advantage. And you will notice that this making of laws to govern people's conduct is really an attempt to turn people into machines, to make them behave like material bodies, like the sun and the stars. And to do that is to attempt to destroy their freedom, to deny their human nature; and—to put it in another way—it is to refuse to trust them. If you trust people you don't try to bind them.

That brings me to the more general answer. People who talk of obeying the laws of morality are treating

MECHANICAL MORALITY

human beings as if they ought to behave like material objects. Material bodies are free, as we have seen, in obeying laws. That is because it is the nature of matter to obey laws. Now we are all so familiar with science and scientific ways of thinking that we have a tendency to think of everything in scientific terms. So we say to ourselves, 'There must be a law governing human behaviour just as there is a law governing the courses of the stars.' We then look at the facts of human life and find that it isn't so; that some people are rebels, and that nearly everybody has lapses at times. So we say, 'Well! if human nature doesn't always behave in accordance with fixed principles, that is just because it is wicked. It *ought* to follow a strict law of good behaviour.' So we get to think that there is a law of good behaviour which we ought to obey even if we don't always obey it. And we think that the better and more moral a man is, the more he does in fact obey the moral law.

What is wrong with all this? Simply that it makes the mistake of thinking that human nature is the same as material nature. It isn't. Material nature is free in obeying laws. Human nature is bound or enslaved in obeying laws. It is not the nature of human beings to act in conformity to law, and therefore their goodness—which we call morality—cannot consist in obedience to law at all. That is not to say that there is no place for law in human life. It means simply that there is no place for law and obedience in morality. Human life has a material basis and a

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

material aspect, and *there* is the place for law. But in the true personal life of human beings, in which alone they express their full nature as moral beings, there is no place for mechanism or obedience.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

X

SOCIAL MORALITY

IN MY last talk I attempted to show you the effect of thinking of human freedom as if it were material freedom. It means that you apply to human life ideas which are only appropriate when we are considering the behaviour of material bodies, and so generate a false morality of a mechanical type. Because matter acts in obedience to law—because that is its nature—mechanical morality teaches us that *we* ought to act in obedience to the moral law. But human nature is not the same as material nature, and therefore mechanical morality is a false morality. We saw what this meant. The idea of a moral law is just an absurdity, and there is no place in good human behaviour for obedience.

To-night we have to consider a second false morality which arises in a similar fashion. If we think of human freedom as organic freedom, if we forget that human nature is different from the nature of plants and animals, and apply to human behaviour the words and ideas that are appropriate to organic life, we generate a second false morality, which I propose to

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

call social morality. If mechanical morality makes the mistake of thinking that human beings are bodies, social morality makes the mistake of thinking that they are organisms. But obviously we are neither bodies nor organisms, we are persons. True morality is neither mechanical nor social, but personal.

We have already discussed the nature of living things, and gathered together the ideas which belong to the field of life. Let us refresh our memories. Every living creature, every organism, has an environment. The environment stimulates it and the organism reacts to the stimulus. As a result, its behaviour is a continuous effort to adapt itself to its environment. This produces the characteristic growth of the organism. It develops, or varies in a definite direction. So the acorn, in reacting to the stimulus of its environment, develops into an oak tree. But the oak tree then produces more acorns and in time they develop into oak trees. There is a transmission of life that links the generations together, and through this there runs that general characteristic of all that lives—the tendency to growth and variation through the continuous effort towards a more and more complete adaptation to a more and more complicated environment. This we call evolution or the development of species or progress. When we look at the world of life from the evolutionary standpoint we find that it is not the individual that counts (for the individual is very limited in his development, grows unadaptable, gets stuck and dies) but the species, the group, the

SOCIAL MORALITY

community of living beings. Life seems to be a great community of living things, of all sorts and kinds, all of which contribute something to the gradual development of a harmony which moves slowly forward from generation to generation, to the accomplishment of a great evolutionary purpose—the purpose of life.

Now suppose that we apply these biological ideas to human life so as to produce a conception of how we ought to behave. We shall then produce a kind of biological morality. How will it talk about human goodness? Let us see. It will talk a great deal about purpose. Each of us ought to have a purpose in life and to work for its achievement, it will say. Then whatever draws us aside from our purpose will be bad and whatever advances it will be good. Stage by stage we must use our opportunities and develop our capacities with our eyes fixed on the goal to which we have devoted our lives. We must admire the single-mindedness of the young man who sets out to become a millionaire, and who sacrifices pleasure and comfort, toiling year after year for the accomplishment of his purpose, adapting himself to circumstances, devoting himself to success. But after all, that is a selfish purpose, even if we admire the self-sacrifice and single-mindedness of the man. There is something ridiculous about a man toiling all his life for a success which he never will have time to enjoy. Why is that? Because he is forgetting that he is a member of a community, that he is a mere individual whose life is a momentary part of the great stream of life. His purpose is too

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

limited. If human life is to be good, it must not forget that the purpose which it serves is not its own purpose but the purpose of life as a whole.

So this second false morality has to look beyond the individual to the community, just as the biologist has to look to the species and the development of the species. We must begin over again from the larger standpoint. Each of us is born into a society and our lives are bound up with the community to which we belong. Human goodness is a common goodness, a social goodness. Life has been transmitted to us by our parents and all our capacities are inherited capacities. Society gives us nourishment and education and the opportunities of self-development. We owe all we have and all we are to the community to which we belong. The community is our real environment, and we live only in it and through it. Therefore the purpose which ought to control our lives is not our own selfish purpose, but the social purpose. We are part of a community of social life, and the goodness of our individual lives depends upon our devoting them to the common good. Each of us has a place and a function in society. Our business is to take our place in the social organization and devote ourselves to our job. So the ideal of social service arises, and social morality. The good man is the man who serves his country, serves his generation, identifies himself with the good of the community and devotes his life to the accomplishment of a social purpose.

What is the social purpose? It is progress—the

SOCIAL MORALITY

development of humanity. We don't merely belong to the present organization of society, for that, in its turn, is only a single scene in the drama of human history. Human life has developed from a primitive savagery. It is gradually becoming civilized. Men are getting wiser and better as generation succeeds generation. As Tennyson puts it:

*'Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose
runs*

*And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of
the suns.'*

Steadily through history have been built up higher and higher types of civilization, and ours is the last of these and the highest. Yet it is only a stage in the process of human evolution, the best that life has produced so far. Our business is therefore to serve the future, to devote our lives not merely to maintaining the good that has been achieved, but to increasing it and broadening it. We must devote ourselves to the cause of progress, to the service of the future. Then we shall be identifying ourselves with the great purpose of life and our own lives will be the best they can be, devoted to the service of humanity.

That is the voice of social morality. You will notice that it talks always of service, of self-devotion, of self-sacrifice. Our duty is to serve others, to serve our country, to serve humanity. It tells us to think of ourselves always as members of the community, and of the community as developing towards a higher type

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

of human life in the future. It is a morality of service. And it is a false morality. It is false because it thinks of human life in biological terms, as if we were animals, not persons.

We must look into its falseness from the human side. Why is it that the ideal of social service and self-devotion to the progress of humanity is a false ideal? Well! in the first place because it is a nonsensical ideal. If we say that goodness consists in serving the community, then everybody must serve. If I want to serve other people, I can't do it unless they are willing to be served. If everybody is to serve, then there is nobody to accept the service. We can't be unselfish if nobody is prepared to be selfish. If a friend and I are out walking and I have one cigarette left and he has none, then I can't act unselfishly and give it to him unless he is prepared to be selfish enough to take it from me. So if you make the service of others an ideal of good-conduct, you will have to insist upon a lot of people being selfish enough to let the others serve them.

But, you may say, we can all serve in the cause of progress. That means that we should all sacrifice ourselves and devote ourselves to the future in order to produce a better world when we are all dead. But if that future society is going to be a good society, it will have to do the same and devote itself to serving a more distant future still; and so on for ever and ever. And nobody will ever get the benefit of all this service and self-sacrifice. Whichever way you take it, the idea

SOCIAL MORALITY

of serving progress is a nonsensical one.

In the second place, a morality of service and self-sacrifice to the community is a denial of human reality. It treats everybody as a means to an end. That is what comes of thinking about human life in terms of purposes. If you are going to judge a man's goodness by what he contributes to the life of the community, then you make him merely an instrument, a tool for doing something. If men are at their best when they are servants, then slavery is the proper condition of human life. And if this purpose is not their own, but the purpose of society or the purpose of life, then it is worse still. Something or someone is using them, as you might use a sixpence to buy sweets or a bus ticket. That is to degrade human life to an animal level. Unless a man thinks for himself and feels for himself and determines for himself what he shall do with his life, he is less than human. If you tell him that he ought to serve society, work for the betterment of conditions in the future, identify himself with the cause of progress; in fact if you tell him that he ought to sacrifice himself or devote himself to anything, and that his goodness consists in that self-sacrifice and devotion; then you are denying his right to be a person, to be himself, to be real.

Lastly, the falseness of social morality is shown by the fact that it inevitably subordinates human beings to organization. Life, in the biological sense, is organization; and evolution is simply the gradual production of more and more highly organized types of

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

living creatures. If you make progress, or the evolution of society, the great goal of human effort, then you are really worshipping social organization. 'The more highly organized a society is, the better it is'—that is what lurks at the back of your mind. There seems to me to be no reason for thinking so. The more highly organized society is, the more complicated it is, that is all. Why should it be better because it is more complicated? It seems to me rather that some types of society, like our own, are much too complicated to be really good. It really is time that we stopped this silly worship of complicated organization. It doesn't make human life better, it only makes it more difficult. Now serving society or humanity always means in practice serving institutions—serving the state or your business or your trade union. And the more you serve institutions the more complicated they become, and the more service they demand; till we all become the slaves of our jobs. The more intricate and complicated the mechanism of social organization becomes, the more men have to subordinate their human qualities and activities to the mere business of keeping the machine working smoothly. And as a result, slowly and surely, they lose their freedom and become themselves only cogs in the machinery. In this way the ideal of social morality undermines human freedom.

What does all this mean, apart from argument? It means this. The working morality of the modern world is a morality of social service. We find ourselves

SOCIAL MORALITY

organized and fitted in to a great machinery of civilization, and we are told that it is our duty to serve it, to identify ourselves with the job we do in the social organization. We find that year after year, generation after generation, the machine is getting more complicated and that our time and energy are being eaten up more and more by the gigantic effort to keep the machine from breaking down. We are becoming the servants of machinery. This is an evil thing, and unless we can stop it, the machine will get so complicated that it will destroy us and itself. The first thing we have got to stop is the false idea that it is a good thing to serve society and its institutions. It isn't. It is an evil thing. The organizations of society are meant to serve us. The state is the servant of its members—that is a good old democratic doctrine. But we have almost turned it topsy-turvy nowadays with our talk about serving the state. Against all such false moral ideas we must insist that a man is a man, and the goodness of his life is in its own inner quality, in its own integrity; not in any service it may do to other people or to the state or the church or the future.

I have tried to show you how this false morality of social service arose and came to dominate our thinking. It comes from thinking about the value of human life in biological terms. The discovery and rapid development of the idea of evolution in the last century is the immediate historical cause. We have got into the habit of thinking in terms of progress and

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

organization and growth and development. These ideas are all right in their own place, when we are dealing with plants and animals. And because we are animals they have a place—a subordinate place—in human life. But we are not merely animals; and our morality, the goodness of our humanity, is not derived from our animal but from our human nature. That is why a morality of progress and social service is a false morality. It treats human nature as if it were merely animal nature and so destroys human freedom. If our duty is to be servants, how can we be free?

REALITY AND FREEDOM

XI

PERSONAL MORALITY

TO-NIGHT WE shall leave behind us the two false moralities that we have criticised and come to the consideration of true morality. We can sum up the conclusions of the last two talks in a very few words. True morality does not consist in obedience to a moral law. It is not mechanical. Neither does it consist in the service of a social ideal. It is not evolutionary. It consists in the personal freedom that comes from personal reality. It is a morality of friendship.

Anything is free, we decided, when it spontaneously expresses its own nature. Persons are free, then, when their activities express their personal nature. To be completely free we have to be completely personal, completely real as persons. It is time to remind you of what I insisted upon earlier, that only real people can be free and do what they want to do. I want to expand that statement a little now. Suppose that a man has got so much money that he can gratify any whim that takes him. That gives him great freedom, doesn't it? But his freedom is only a material freedom.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

Can he do what he pleases? That depends on all sorts of things. He can't buy what he pleases, unless other people are willing to sell him what he wants. He may want things, and almost certainly *will* want things, that money can't buy. He may want to play a big part in politics, but if he hasn't the brains and the training that are necessary for that, he just can't do it. He may be afraid of other people, or of public opinion, and be very anxious to be well thought of in society. In that case he will have to do what other people want him to do; to please them. Then he won't be able to do what *he* wants to do. After all, money is only a means of getting things. It can provide you with the means for doing what you want to do, so far as it goes. But unless you have something that you want to do, something that you need it for, it is no use to you whatever. There are lots of people who have too little money, who need more if they are to be free in the proper sense. But the amount of money or possessions that anyone really wants is quite limited. Nobody really wants a lot of money; people only think they do. What they really want is something else, something that they think they could have if they had a lot of money. And they are usually quite mistaken. We have only got to look at the very rich people to see that hardly any of them know what they want to do with their wealth. For they are mostly doing one of two things with it. They are either trying to get more when they have already too much. Or they are doing all the stupid things that other people with

PERSONAL MORALITY

plenty of money do, bound hand and foot by the social fashions of their particular set. They do just what other people do, on a more elaborate scale. In either case they obviously don't know what they want to do with their wealth. Nobody who knows what he wants to do follows a fashion. And if you don't know what you want to do, of course you can't do it.

Now that example brings us back to the question of real people. Real people think for themselves and feel for themselves; and as a result they know what they want to do. They don't need other people to tell them. They don't have to discover what the fashion is, in order to do what other people do. For that reason they are the only people who really know what they themselves want to do, and that is at least the indispensable first step towards being able to do what you want to do. Nobody can be free unless they know what they want to do, even if they are as wealthy as a Rockefeller. This, I imagine, will let you see what I mean by personal freedom—the basis of true morality. It is a quality of a person's character. It does not depend upon his circumstances, neither upon his wealth nor upon his political and social condition, though these may circumscribe and limit the expression of his freedom. Human freedom itself consists in the inner quality of a man's life. Unless a man is able to make up his own mind what he himself wants, unless he decides for himself what is worth while doing, unless he has a faith of his very own—not a borrowed one—he is not free and cannot be free,

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

whatever his nationality or his station in life. One of the surest signs of a man's freedom is his ability to be alone, to stand alone, to be different from other people—think differently and feel differently and behave differently. If he can't do that, if he must be in the fashion and go with the crowd, if he is unhappy unless he thinks and feels the same as his fellows, then he isn't free and he can't do what he wants to do.

That, then, is the first main point about personal freedom. We are free just so far as we think and feel for ourselves, and keep thought and feeling in harmony by acting upon our own thoughts and feelings. In other words, we are personally free in proportion as we are personally real. But there is a second main point which must not be dissociated from this one. We can only be free in so far as we think and feel and act in terms of what is not ourselves. Day-dreaming is not thinking for ourselves and sentimentality is not feeling for ourselves. People who are self-centred and egoistic cannot be free. That is my answer to those of my listeners who have objected that people who do as they please are just spoilt children, with no thought or care for anyone but themselves. The person whose thoughts pay no attention to the facts isn't thinking for himself. He isn't thinking at all. The person whose feelings take no account of the real significance of the world around him is just not feeling. Real thought and real feeling are *about* the real world and in terms of its realities. If you cut yourself off in any way from the life around you, your own reality is lost, and with

PERSONAL MORALITY

it your freedom. And to bring this discussion to its culminating point, let me say that we are only persons at all through our relations with other persons. We are real only if our personal relations are real. We are free only in and through the reality of our friendships. Morality, or human goodness is essentially a matter of friendship. Friendship—not friendliness.

Let me explain a little. Freedom, which is the basis of morality, is a matter of spontaneous self-expression in action. If a man is to express himself in action he must first be himself. That is obvious, and we all know how difficult it is. What I want now to stress is the fact that human nature is essentially the capacity to think and feel about the reality of the world outside. It is the ability to know things truly and value them at their proper worth. We can sum it up by saying that to be ourselves is to live in communion with what is not ourselves. But this communion with a reality which is not ourselves is only possible through other people. If we are to express ourselves at all, we must not only be ourselves in a kind of Olympian isolation, we must have someone to express ourselves to. The core of human freedom lies therefore in our capacity to be ourselves for other people. The real obstacles to human freedom are just those things which make it difficult or impossible for us to be completely free in expressing our thoughts and feelings to other people. I need hardly tell you what these are. You know them as well as I do. A correspondent in last week's *Listener* wrote to remind

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

us that friendship implies restraint. 'How often', he writes, 'do we restrain ourselves in the presence of a friend from discussing things which might "hurt his feelings"; whereas we may speak comparatively freely before an acquaintance, not valuing his respect so much as we value the love of a friend.' Now that goes to the root of the matter. We do behave in that way; perhaps it is often necessary that we should. But for all that it is not a good thing. Surely the less we need to disguise our thoughts and feelings from a friend, the deeper and more real the friendship is. Surely this is just the acid test of the reality of our relations with him. If you look into it you will see that the statement I have quoted is a disguised way of saying that we can't trust our friends. We can speak freely to a mere acquaintance because we don't need to trust him. We don't care much whether he respects us or not. But with a friend whom we love and whose love we value it is different. Why is it different? Because we don't trust his love for us. We are afraid that if we let him know us as we really are, he would not love us any longer. That is what the writer of the letter has said. If it is true it is surely a desperate revelation of our unreality. I must confess that that is how most people behave. They can't bring themselves to believe that one person can love another for what he really is in himself. In effect they say, 'If my friend is to love me I must pretend to him that I am better than I really am. And if I am going to love him he must pretend that I am better than I really am.' All

PERSONAL MORALITY

I can say is that I don't believe it. It is the ultimate denial of human life. If friendship must be founded on pretence then life is rotten at the heart. I will say more. To behave as if this were true is the essence of immorality, the absolute denial of human goodness. If it is true that we can't love people and be loved by them for themselves and for ourselves, as we really are—if that is true, then the Devil is King of the earth and we are his servants. If Christianity means anything it means that.

This, then, is the central conclusion of our long discussion. Morality is the expression of personal freedom. That freedom is grounded in our capacity to be real and to love reality. The supreme reality of human life is the reality of persons, and of persons in personal relation with one another. Friendship, therefore, is the essence of morality. I have explained what I mean by that. Ultimately our own reality consists precisely in our ability to know people as they really are and to love them for what they really are. Everything that prevents that—fear or pride or the passion for wealth or power or position in men, the subordination of human beings to organizations and institutions, an unjust distribution of wealth or opportunity in the community—everything that opposes or denies the inherent right of a human individual to be himself and to realize and love the reality of other human beings, is the enemy of morality. To be oneself freely and spontaneously, to realize oneself—that is to be a good man or woman. And if any young

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

listeners think still that that is easy, that it is merely a matter of giving a free rein to your instincts and impulses, I must have expressed myself very badly. The man who really achieved it would find himself, I doubt not, as so many of the real people of other ages have found themselves, at war with the whole massed forces of his civilization.

In conclusion, may I make one disconnected remark. Some people have taken my distinction between real and unreal people to be a hard and fast distinction. I didn't mean it like that. Nobody is just real or just unreal. Personal reality is a matter of degree. We are not endowed with reality at birth; we have to create our own reality by a continuous effort and struggle. We are all more or less unreal. Our business is to make ourselves a little more real than we are.

REALITY AND FREEDOM

XII

THE FINAL SUMMARY:

SELF-REALIZATION

DURING THE long course of the argument of these talks, which has covered a very wide field, I have had again and again to put in a few sentences important positions which could only be properly expounded at much greater length. It is inevitable, under these circumstances, that misunderstandings should arise, though I hope that, on the whole, they are not serious misunderstandings on the main points at issue. I propose, then, to spend this talk upon possible misunderstandings and to use these in a final attempt to make my main contention clear.

It is obvious, from a letter which appeared recently in the *Morning Post* that some people have got the impression that I have been preaching something perilously like Bolshevism, and that my views are anti-religious and destructive of morality. That, I think, is a very strange misapprehension; and I can't believe that anyone who has actually listened to what I had to say could really come to that conclusion. But at the same time a good many things that I have said must have made some of my listeners anxious about

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

the social application of the view of morality and of personal freedom which I have put forward. Let me deal with this large point first.

What I have had to say, from first to last, has been definitely related to our present social situation. It is not just abstract philosophy, but an attempt to solve the philosophical problems involved in modern life. The foundations of our society and of our civilization are very shaky. That is obvious, I think. What is the matter? That is the first question to ask ourselves.

The answer I have given you is that we have lost our faith, and having lost our faith we are gradually losing our freedom and our reality. That shows itself most clearly in religion and morality. So far from wishing to destroy religion and morality, I am desperately anxious to restore them. The decay of religion is the surest sign of the decay of human life and social life. The decay of morality follows it, because that, too, is a decay of faith. But when I talk about religion and morality, I mean real religion and real morality, not the empty forms or the sham substitutes for them. Religion means faith in God and communion with God, or it means nothing; and morality means faith in human life and human freedom, or it is a mere sham.

Now it seems clear to me that in its inner life our society is steadily getting more and more unreal. We are losing faith and losing grip on reality. But life has to go on and there must be something to keep it going. The positive spring of human life is faith, a

THE FINAL SUMMARY

passionate sense of the reality and significance of life. If that fails, then people fall back—they are bound to fall back—upon the negative spring of life, which is fear. As faith leaves us fear takes its place as the governor of life. To-day we are all afraid—afraid of the future, afraid of doing anything unless everybody else does it too, afraid of other nations, afraid of one another, afraid of making mistakes, afraid of facing facts. When people are full of fear, there is no hope for them. And let me say this to the people who shout 'Bolshevism' when anybody suggests a new thought about society—they are not proving that Bolshevism is foolish or wicked; they are not helping to prevent Bolshevism spreading; they are merely parading their terror of life and their lack of faith.

Now when people grow afraid, when there is a secret hidden fear at the centre of their consciousness, they have lost faith in themselves, and they begin to clutch at anything to save them. And they turn always to power, especially to organized power. They want an authority to take the burden of responsibility off their shoulders. They become formalists in religion and morality. They get excited about money and position because they want to be safe and secure. They want everybody to agree with them, because then they feel safe in their beliefs. That is when the false morality of obedience to law becomes rampant. People want an authority to tell them what to do, to make them feel safe. Anyone who imagines that to repudiate the morality of obedience to a moral law is

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

to make an attack on Christianity, ought to start at once to read the New Testament. For most of what I said about morality is said there. Unfortunately, most of what is now called Christianity has little enough to do with the teaching of Jesus, or even of St. Paul. If any of my listeners feel that they would like to follow up what I have had to say about morality and freedom I could not do better than advise them to read the New Testament, carefully, for themselves and without prejudice.

Now let me say something about social morality, which is really more important for us. I have said that to make a moral ideal out of social service is wrong. I will go further and say that it is at the present moment the greatest danger that faces our country. Let me try to tell you why I think so. In the first place, let it be understood that I am not attacking what we know as the social services or all the unselfish devotion that so many people show to the helpless and the needy. I am as anxious as anyone to clear up the miserable social mess that we have got ourselves into. Let that be clear. What I *am* repudiating is the attempt to turn the idea of serving humanity or society or the state into a substitute for morality. And I repudiate it because I think that it is precisely the thing that has got us into the mess. Because in practice it means serving organizations. Humanity is a vague, indefinite word that means very little. In practice it means the people you live amongst. If you must serve, or use the word service, then I will not

THE FINAL SUMMARY

object to your serving the people you know—your friends and acquaintances. But serving people in general usually means serving nobody in particular. You can't be human if you live by statistics. That is why I insist that morality means friendship. If you are anxious to do your duty by the unemployed, then you have got to do something for the family you know about in the next street. If you mean by social service, doing good to definite, living, suffering people, that is all right. I have only this to say, that you will find that the only way you can really serve people in a way that really matters is to enter into friendship with them.

If, however, you say, 'We can do a great deal for masses of people whom we don't know personally, and that that is what is meant by social service, getting rid of unemployment, providing hospitals and recreation grounds and better schools for the poor and so on—what of that?' then I reply that all that is very necessary but it is no substitute for personal morality. It is a matter of bare justice, and it has got to be done. But to erect it into a moral ideal is another matter. To do that is to wash your hands of the business and to get some organization to do it for you. All this vague benevolence for people in general, or for classes of people like the unemployed, is really sentimental. It isn't real. What the unemployed need is not pity from a distance, but their bare rights as members of an astonishingly wealthy community. We have to see that they get their rights, and not pat ourselves on the

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

back for our benevolence when we are merely being honest and decent.

That is one side of it. But there is another. If we make a morality of social service, in practice, we hand ourselves over to organization; and in the long run that means handing ourselves over to the state. The vast increase of state organization in recent years has not made human life better. It has only made a large number of people wealthier; and it has done it at the expense of human freedom and human goodness. The progress of organization which we are so proud of has *produced* unemployment. Your social problems are the results of progress. I am not talking as a reactionary. What I mean is this. All organization is a means to an end, and it is to be judged by its results. It is good so far as it makes human life freer and richer. It is an evil thing when it makes life more of a slavery and emptier. And it seems to me that it has in fact done that for us. I do not believe that the inner quality and richness of the lives of the mass of men and women has been made greater and better by the progress of social organization in the last century. It seems to me to be definitely impoverished. Therefore I think that it is time to call a halt and ask ourselves in what the inner significance and value of human life consists. If we can be better human beings by being poorer, then by all means let us get rid of some of our wealth.

Further, if you teach people to make an ideal of social service you teach them to pin their hopes to the

THE FINAL SUMMARY

development of the organization of society, and that means to put their faith in politics. That means one of two things—Bolshevism or Fascism. Bolshevism and Fascism are the two ideals which rest upon the deification of organized society. Both of them believe that social service is the true moral ideal, that a man's whole goodness consists in being a good citizen. In repudiating social morality as a false morality, I am repudiating Bolshevism and Fascism equally. If I had to choose between the two I should, I confess, choose Bolshevism, because at least it repudiates the belief in mere wealth. But I don't want either. I believe that a man's goodness consists in being a man in all the fullness of his humanity; and for that he must be free. A man's true significance does not lie in his job, in his service to society, in his citizenship. It lies in being a man—in the inner quality of his own consciousness. There have been men who died rather than deny the integrity of their own humanity, and they are the moral heroes of the world.

There is one other point which I should like to emphasize in closing. I have said a good deal about feeling and its importance; and some people have run away with the idea that I meant that people should simply gratify their passions, and do anything that came into their heads. So let me put that very important point in relation to our present social organization. Just as thought is concerned, in a peculiar sense, with truth, so feeling is peculiarly concerned with beauty. A morality that looks upon feeling as some-

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD

thing naturally dangerous and untrustworthy is a morality that despises beauty and looks upon it as a side issue. I am inclined to think that the worst feature of modern life is its failure to believe in beauty. For human life beauty is as important as truth—even more important—and beauty in life is the product of real feeling. The strongest condemnation of modern industrial life is not that it is cruel and materialistic and wearisome and false, but simply that it is ugly and has no sense of beauty. Moral conduct is beautiful conduct. If we want to make the world better, as my critic in *The Observer* does—and I agree with him—the main thing we have to do is to make it more beautiful. Nothing that is not inherently beautiful is really good. We have to recapture the sense of beauty if we are not to lose our freedom. And that we can only do by learning to feel for ourselves and to feel really. This is not a side issue. It is the heart of the problem of modern civilization. We shall never be saved by science, though we may be destroyed by it. It is to art and religion that we must look; and both of these depend on freedom of feeling. Our science is the best thing we have, but it is not good enough for the task that lies before us, because it is concerned only with the things of the mind. There are signs—small signs—of a revival of interest in and reverence for beauty amongst us. But it is a small thing yet. I for one would pin my hopes to it rather than to anything else; much rather than to a revival of trade. It is vulgarity that is the matter with

THE FINAL SUMMARY

us—particularly the vulgarity of our moral ideas; and vulgarity is just another name for bad feeling. The only cure for it is emotional sincerity, a refusal to like anything or do anything that we don't sincerely *feel* to be worth while; and with that, a refusal to be frightened out of doing what we feel to be worth doing, whoever and whatever disapproves of it.

That, then, is my philosophy of freedom, so far as the limitations of time and conditions allow me to expound it. I have no doubt that it has left many questions unanswered and many ragged ends hanging loose. But I hope that the main idea of it has somehow got through the microphone. It is in fact quite simple. Self-realization is the true moral ideal. But to realize ourselves we have to be ourselves, to make ourselves real. That means thinking and feeling really, for ourselves, and expressing our own reality in word and action. And this is freedom, and the secret of it lies in our capacity for friendship.



BR
41
U6
1925a

THE CHURCH'S OBLIGATION IN VIEW OF GOD'S PURPOSE FOR THE WORLD



American Section
Report of Commission I

to

THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

*Stockholm
1925*

HELD IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN
August 19-30, 1925

**UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK**

Commission Reports

- I. The Church's Obligation in View of
God's Purpose for the World.**
- II. The Church and Economic and Industrial
Problems.**
- III. The Church and Social and Moral Prob-
lems.**
- IV. The Church and International Relations.**
- V. The Church and Education.**
- VI. Methods of Co-operative and Federative
Efforts By the Christian Communions.**

GENERAL PREFACE

A few words should be written about the inception of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In the summer of 1919 the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches met at The Hague. This was the first meeting of an international character held after the signing of the Armistice, if one excepts a small gathering of labor leaders. About sixty leaders of the Churches were present, representing nearly all the Protestant Communions and most of the countries of Europe. Ten or twelve delegates were present from America.

The meetings at The Hague developed so sweet and reasonable an atmosphere, at a time when great bitterness prevailed everywhere, and the delegates present expressed themselves so strongly as to the un-Christian character of war and the necessity of establishing a world order on a new and Christian basis, that several of the delegates felt strongly that the time had come for the Churches officially to get together and say what these Churchmen semi-officially were saying. As a result Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of America, the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and others held an informal meeting to discuss the possibility of bringing the Churches of the world together for a Conference, where the Churches could utter their united conviction on international matters and all other matters with which society would have to deal in the reconstruction of civilization and the building of a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old, which lay all about them.

This preliminary meeting was not altogether spontaneous for on two separate occasions during the progress of the war, Archbishop Soederblom had communicated with the Churches of Europe and America regarding the possibility of such a conference and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America had suggested that a Conference of the Federated bodies of Churches in all the countries might meet together after the war. The unanimous opinion of the unofficial group at The Hague was that a committee should be appointed to bring the leaders of the Churches together with the aim of convincing them of the necessity of such a world gathering of the Churches, and asking them to take the matter up with their respective denominations. This committee went from The Hague to Paris and brought together as many of the leaders of the Churches as possible upon such short notice. This meeting became greatly interested in the project and requested Dr. Frederick Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenical Conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America to arrange for a preliminary meeting of the Churches the following summer.

Dr. Lynch proceeded from Paris to London and had several interviews with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F. B. Myers, Dr. Thomas Nightingale, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare and others. Meantime, Archbishop Soderbloom undertook to interest the Scandinavian Churches and Dr. Choisy

the Swiss Churches. Sufficient interest was aroused to warrant the calling of a preliminary Conference at Geneva in the summer of 1920.

As a result of the procedures recorded above, one hundred delegates assembled at Geneva in August of 1920. A three days session was held and the Conference gradually began to assume shape. Great interest was manifested and all present expressed themselves to the effect that the Church Universal had a great opportunity to exert a determining influence upon the new order that must follow the war. Furthermore the world was waiting for some great pronouncement from the Churches upon such questions as war and peace, the industrial order; such immediate problems as those having to do with intemperance and vice and upon all ethical and moral questions. It was felt that a positive and commanding utterance of the Churches in these trying years would do much to encourage a disheartened world and would make it much easier for those who were trying to reconstruct the world on a Christian basis to carry on this high task. There was much confusion in the world as to just where the Church did stand on these great problems disturbing the minds of men. The conviction was expressed that only as the rule of life laid down by the gospels became the law of nations could any hope for security and peace be found or the great sores of the world be healed.

Furthermore it was felt by all that whatever new international machinery might be set up or whatever new industrial order might arise, it was only as these were permeated by the spirit of Jesus Christ that they would fulfill the high hopes of their founders. It was also strongly felt that two great blessings might ensue from such a Conference. On the one hand all individual communions would profit by this period of common intercourse, especially those communions that had greatly suffered from the war. They would be made strong in the consciousness of the oneness of all Christ's disciples. On the other hand the coming together, if only for a month, of all the Churches of the world, to cooperate in the common task of redeeming the world order, and to make some great common pronouncement on the place of Christ in our civilization would be a great object lesson to the world.

At Geneva a large International Committee was set up which was divided into four groups, one for America, one for the British Empire, one for the European Protestant churches and the fourth representing the Orthodox Eastern Church. The International Committee appointed a smaller Executive Committee, which held three meetings in successive years, one at Peterborough, England, one at Zurich, Switzerland and one at Amsterdam, Holland. In August, 1922, the International Committee itself met at Helsingborg, Sweden, and was very fully attended by delegates from all the communions and nations. At this meeting the programme for the Conference assumed final shape. It was voted that the program for Stockholm should include the following groups of subjects:

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's purpose for the world.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The reports which followed are in fulfillment of this vote taken at Helsingborg. In April, 1924, the full Committee met again at Birmingham, England, in connection with C. O. P. E. C. and reviewed the progress made upon the reports and dealt specifically with plans for the Stockholm meeting.

This is in brief the history of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and is the explanation of the reports which follow. These reports have been prepared with great care by the leaders of the Churches and by experts in the several questions discussed. They are submitted to the Conference in the hope that the Conference will receive them in the same spirit in which they have been written, i.e. in the endeavor to find the common consciousness of the Churches upon these subjects and to voice its united feeling.

LIST OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Joint-Chairmen

- REV. J. ROSS STEVENSON, D.D.
President of Princeton Theological Seminary
- REV. JAMES I. VANCE, D.D.
Pastor of First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tennessee.

Secretaries

- FENNELL P. TURNER
Secretary of Foreign Missions Conference of North America.
- REV. CHARLES L. GOODELL, D.D.
Executive Secretary of Commission on Evangelism and Life Service of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Members

- ALEXANDER, ARCHBISHOP OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA
Greek Orthodox Church
- ANDERSON, PROFESSOR FREDERICK L.
Department of New Testament Interpretation, The Newton Theological Institution.
- BADER, REV. JESSE M.
Secretary of Evangelism, Disciples of Christ.
- BELL, REV. W. Y.
Pastor of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.
- BROMER, REV. EDWARD S., D.D.
The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States.
- BURTON, REV. CHARLES E., D.D.
Secretary of The National Council of the Congregational Churches.
- CAVERT, REV. SAMUEL MCCREA
General Secretary of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- CHAMBERLAIN, REV. WILLIAM I., Ph.D.
Corresponding Secretary of The Board of Foreign Missions of Reformed Church in America.
- CHESTER, REV. SAMUEL H., D.D.
Advisory Secretary and Editor of Executive Committee of Foreign Missions Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
- COREY, REV. STEPHEN J., D.D.
Vice-President of United Christian Missionary Society Secretary of Department of Foreign Missions.
- DAY, REV. WILLIAM HORACE, D.D.
Pastor of The United Church (Congregational) in Bridgeport, Connecticut.
- EWING, REV. J. C. R., D.D.
Former President of Forman Christian College, Lahore, India.
- FAGLEY, REV. FREDERICK L., D.D.
Executive Secretary of Commission on Evangelism and Devotional Life of National Council of Congregational Churches.
- FLINN, REV. RICHARD ORME, D.D.
Pastor of North Avenue Presbyterian Church in Atlanta, Georgia.
- FORSYTH, REV. DAVID D., D.D.
Corresponding Secretary of Board of Home Missions and Church Extension Methodist Episcopal Church.
- GODDARD, REV. O. E., D.D.
Pastor of McKendree Methodist Church in Nashville, Tennessee.
- GRUNERT, REV. FRANCIS E.
Pastor of The Moravian Church (Protestant Episcopal).

- HARDCASTLE, REV. J.
Member of Faculty, Board of Education and Theological School under supervision
of Primitive Methodist General Conference.
- HELFENSTEIN, REV. ROY C., D.D.
Pastor of People's Church in Dover, Delaware.
- HODOUS, PROF. LEWIS, D.D.
Secretary, The Kennedy School of Missions (Hartford Seminary Foundation).
- HOUGH, REV. S. S.
Executive Secretary of United Enlistment Movement.
- LANGDALE, REV. JOHN W., D.D.
Pastor of New York Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church in Brooklyn, New York.
- MACKENZIE, REV. WILLIAM DOUGLAS, D.D.
President Hartford Seminary Foundation.
- MARQUIS, REV. JOHN A., D.D.
General Secretary, Board of Home Missions of Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.
- McNAUGHER, REV. JOHN, D.D.
President Pittsburgh Theological Seminary.
- MELISH, REV. J. HOWARD, D.D.
Rector of Holy Trinity Church in Brooklyn, New York.
- MONTGOMERY, MRS. W. A.
President, Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missions Society.
- MOTT, JOHN R., LL. D.
General Secretary, The International Committee of Young Men's Christian
Associations.
- PINSON, REV. W. W.
Secretary for Oriental Fields of Board of Missions of Methodist Episcopal Church,
South.
- POHLMAN, REV. A., D.D.
Pastor of Temple Lutheran Church in Philadelphia.
- REAVIS, REV. J. O., D.D.
Secretary of Board of Foreign Missions of Presbyterian Church in the United
States.
- RICHARDS, PROFESSOR GEORGE W., D.D.
President Theological Seminary of Reformed Churches in the United States.
- de SCHWEINITZ, REV. PAUL, D.D.
Secretary of Missions of Moravian Church in America.
- SPEERS, JAMES M.
Merchant. Vice-President of Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.
- SPENCER, MISS CLARISSA H.
Secretary for Religious Education in the Education and Research Division of
the National Board of Young Women's Christian Associations.
- STONE, REV. JOHN TIMOTHY, D.D.
Pastor of Fourth Presbyterian Church in Chicago, Illinois.
- TOMKINS, REV. FLOYD W., D.D.
Pastor of The Church of The Holy Trinity in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- VOORHEES, REV. OSCAR McM., D.D.
Pastor of Mott Haven Church in New York City.
- WHITE, REV. CHARLES L., D.D.
Executive Secretary of American Baptist Home Mission Society.
- WILDER, ROBERT P.
General Secretary of Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions.
- WINSBOROUGH, MRS. W. C.
Superintendent of Women's Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, U. S.
- WOELFKIN, REV. CORNELIUS, D.D.
Pastor of Park Avenue Baptist Church.
- WOLF, REV. LUTHER B., D.D.
Secretary of Board of Home Missions, United Lutheran Church in America.
- WOLLE, REV. EDWARD S.
Pastor of Second Moravian Church in New York City.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
General Preface	III
Introductory Note	1
I. Evangelism	2
II. Home Missions	4
III. Foreign Missions	8
1. The Compelling Need of the Foreign Mission Enterprise.	
2. The Beginnings of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise Among the Churches of North America.	
3. The Growth of The American Foreign Missionary Movement.	
4. The Causes of This Growth.	
5. Hindrances to Progress of Foreign Mission Movement to be Faced in America.	
IV. Recruiting for Christian Service at Home and Abroad.....	19
Bibliography	21

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Two Commissions were originally organized by the American Executive Committee, one to make a study of Evangelism and Life Service and the other of Foreign Missions. Tentative reports were prepared and presented to the International Executive Committee. This Committee, after a survey of the whole field of Christian life and work, decided that it would be better to merge these two Commissions into one and assign to it as an appropriate subject of study the Obligation of the Church in View of God's Purpose for the World. This comprehensive subject may be interpreted in such a way as to include the work of the five other Commissions, since God's purpose and the Church's corresponding obligation must take into account economic and industrial problems, international relations and the cooperative efforts of Christian Communions.

Conceding this, the thought of the Executive Committee in assigning to Commission I such an all embracing subject was to furnish a background in the light of which the other subjects might be considered more concretely and extensively.

The members of Commission I have therefore interpreted their task as being introductory and subservient to the work of the remaining Commissions. The great problems of the day, whether economic, social, national or racial are directly related to the obligation of the Christian Church, and this obligation can only be given clearness and compelling power as God's purpose revealed in Jesus Christ, the supreme head of the Church, is taken into account. The life and work of the Church as it will be considered in all its phases and portents by the Universal Christian Conference presupposes a message, an Evangel, the effective proclamation of which is the primary task of the Church. Home Missions antedate as a rule in the Church's consideration the special problems concerned with the application of Christian truth to the varied departments and relationships of life. The same thing is true on the foreign field where educational, medical and industrial missions presuppose or are vitally related to evangelistic effort. For the preaching of the Gospel, for the conduct of missions at home and abroad, the fundamental problem in the life and work of the Church is to secure a sufficiently numerous and an adequately trained leadership. Consequently the studies of Commission I have followed four lines of investigation, namely: Evangelism, Home Missions, Foreign Missions and Recruiting. These topics have been considered solely from the point of view of the American Churches. Any thorough consideration of these topics naturally raises theological problems. The recent Conference in Birmingham, England, on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship found it necessary to assign to its first Commission the comprehensive theme, "The Nature of God and His Purpose for the World." Our Commission has assumed that the approaching World Conference on Faith and Order will take into consideration all those doctrinal questions which naturally emerge from a thorough going study of the message of the Church and the manner of its presentation. The report is of a fragmentary character because of the

necessary limitations imposed by the International Executive Committee.

The thirty Protestant Evangelical Communion represented by this Commission include approximately 40% of the Protestant Evangelicals in the United States of America. There is much in common in the teaching and practice of these varied branches of the Church of Christ.

They all worship the one God, the Creator and Father of Mankind, infinite in wisdom, goodness and love.

They all accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, who for our salvation lived and died and rose again and liveth evermore. They all recognize the influence of the Holy Spirit, who interprets the teachings of Christianity, convicts the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment, and renews, comforts and inspires the souls of men.

They all read the Bible and accept its teachings in matters of faith and conduct as authoritative. They all repeat the prayer Jesus taught His disciples.

They all use bread and wine as the elements of the Communion Service.¹

They all baptize in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

They all have essentially a common practice of worship; using similar prayers and hymns; reading the Scriptures, preaching sermons on the same great truths of Bible teaching and Christian living.¹

They all aim at the creation of the same type of Christian character, as exemplified by the same Christian virtues—"love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith, patience, meekness, temperance."

I

EVANGELISM

The purpose of God made known to us in Christ Jesus is that His Kingdom shall come; that all men shall be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth; that men shall live together as brethren; and that there shall be for all the "life more abundant."

The obligation of the Church, therefore, is to proclaim the good news of the Kingdom and to embody in the lives of its members the spirit of the Master in order that they may be indeed the light of the world and efficient workers with God, for the fulfillment of his purpose.

In view of the divine purpose for the world the responsibility for the Church is threefold. First it is to fit its own members for the Kingdom; and third it is to inspire all men to work for the coming of the Kingdom.

In fulfillment of the first responsibility the Church draws together its members for worship, for the study of God's word, for the training of children and youth in the Christian way of life, for the ministry of

¹The Quakers do not use any external elements in any services. They do not have an external communion service. There is a difference, however, in the method of worship. In some parts the Society of Friends hymns are used and in other parts they are not and the service is held with much silence and all public exercises are spontaneous and unprogrammed.

preaching, for mutual encouragement in good work, for bearing testimony to religious experiences, and for the encouragement of the more spiritually minded to lead the nominal members of the Church into a higher communion with God and a deeper fellowship with other Christians, in order that everyone may make some contribution to the spiritual life of all.

The second part of the Church's responsibility is, through the exercise of its prophetic function, to bring about those conditions in the physical, educational, political and economic environment which make it more conducive for individuals to choose to become Christians and to live according to Christian standards and ideas. This involves:

- the creation of a physical environment and moral atmosphere where living conditions are wholesome, health is protected and the sick and handicapped are properly cared for in order that they may be restored, where possible, to economic independence;

- the development of an educational system whose processes shall be directed to produce character and citizenship;

- the attainment of a government supported by popular intelligence, administered by uncorruptible and capable men, and devoted to the service of its own people and to the good of mankind;

- the creation of an economic system in which the spirit of Mammon is displaced by the spirit of Christianity; in which human values transcend property rights; and the motive of service rather than of profit is dominant.

The third part of the Church's responsibility—as understood in America—is to secure from those who are not in its membership an acceptance of the truth of Christian teachings, repentance for sin, faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, decision to follow him, and membership in the Church.

To accomplish these objects the Church in the United States has found certain methods advantageous, namely:—

First—Within the United States the Churches reach out one by one, and particularly through denominational organizations, to assist communities which are unable to maintain an adequate ministry of the Gospel, to effect an organization, to build edifices and to conduct regular services. Schools are established where there is need beyond the provision of the State, and agencies for religious education, particularly for the training of Christian ministers and other workers. The extension of the Gospel is also furthered by the distribution of literature, the Bible, tracts, periodicals, and particularly Sunday School teaching and study material. Institutions of mercy and relief are maintained, including hospitals, homes, rescue missions, and the like. Special efforts are made to reach those groups little touched by Christian influence and having no connection with the Church.

Second—The Churches maintain Missionary Societies which send into foreign fields consecrated men and women, trained to preach Christ and to establish centers of Christian life and influence. Thus groups are formed, the members of which strengthen one another in

spiritual living. These groups in turn extend their influence in ever-widening circles within which schools and other Christian institutions are developed.

In seeking to meet their responsibility the Protestant churches have been successful to the extent that 29,963,221 men, women and children are enrolled to membership out of an actual Protestant population of 65,000,000. 197,371 ordained ministers and 220,883 church buildings with an approximate value of five billions are maintained. Some four hundred and fifty million dollars are contributed each year for religious purposes, including forty millions for home missionary work exclusive of educational institutions, and thirty-nine millions for carrying the Gospel into foreign lands.*

Because of constantly changing populations, every year thousands of names are removed from the church rolls by revision. The failures of the Church are the failures of Christian discipleship. The churches also hesitate to support progressive measures in industry and in other departments of human welfare. The spirit of the Master is a leaven in the Church but the whole is far from being perfectly leavened.

Most of the Churches are making an increased effort to take Christ in earnest and to follow in His footsteps. Many of their members are seeking with renewed enthusiasm to exemplify in their lives the unifying and revivifying power of divine love and to take an ever enlarging interest in the world's affairs, that the Kingdom of this world may in truth become the Kingdom of the Lord and Saviour of mankind.

II

HOME MISSIONS

A

1. The purpose of Home Missions in general is to give "the Gospel of Christ in all its fullness and the service of Christ in all its implications" to those areas and those people in the United States of America, who would not otherwise have such ministry. Its chief significance, as distinguished from other forms of Christian work in the Homeland, is that it deals primarily with the "margins" of our national life. "The last man," geographically, socially, economically, is its chief concern. Without Home Missions, the Church could maintain itself wherever the resources and the religious interest are sufficient for the independent maintenance of religious organization, but only there. Without Home Missions, then, religious extension would be limited largely by local considerations of economic well-being and of prior religious aptitude.

2. Home Missions serve as the outreaching agency of the whole Church in the creation of a Christian nation, and that in a democratic society where religious affiliation is a matter of personal choice.

*The United States of America has no State Church. Membership, therefore in all the communions is individual and voluntary. It is to be borne in mind that the Roman Catholic Church has a different basis for membership, counting all who have been baptized.

By a "Christian nation" we mean:

- (a) A nation in which a large proportion of the population profess their personal allegiance to Christ as Lord and Saviour, and seek to follow His ideals of life and conduct.
- (b) A nation in which policies and institutions are founded upon and guided by the Christian teachings of righteousness, justice, freedom, mercy and goodwill.
- (c) A nation in which the Christian Church, like all other religious organizations, is free to carry forward its ministry, without let or hindrance, and is protected in this freedom by the State.
- (d) A nation in which Christian principles are the most influential factor in the formation of public opinion, and therefore in determining national attitudes and policies.
- (e) A nation in which Christian institutions and ideals are within reach of all the people.

B

The areas and groups with which Home Missions in America deal are:

1. **Frontiers**—America has just passed through a century of very rapid development of new areas. To meet the needs of these new communities the churches in the several denominations have developed their various home missionary agencies for sending the Church, the school, religious literature and other Christian ministries with the settlers, wherever they have gone. In the extensive territory of the United States a not inconsiderable amount of area still awaits development. Frontier home missionary work therefore continues. There are also social and economic frontiers which generate problems upon which the efforts of the Christian Church are focused through home missions.

2. **Readjusted populations** are many in the United States. Rural communities that once were strong enough to maintain the ministry of the Gospel are depleted by the exhaustion of resources or the development of neighboring cities, leaving considerable populations unable to support the Church, the school and other Christian institutions. So also in the city is the degeneration which results in the slums and the submerged community where financial inability or moral inaptitude make it necessary for Christian influences to be brought to bear from without.

Likewise in rapidly growing cities new communities need the assistance of the Church as a whole in order to initiate strong religious activity. Here by grants of aid in erecting churches, parsonages and other institutions, by assistance in providing ministers and Christian workers, and by other ways, Home Missions plant the institutions of Christianity in new urban communities.

3. **Retarded and submerged groups**, such as Negroes, not yet free from the handicap of slavery; mountain populations of the South—the descendants of the original settlers,—left aside by routes of transportation and by the social and industrial developments of modern life; the

American Indian and similar groups, all these require the strong assistance of the Churches through Home Missions.

4. **Migratory and unattached people** in vast numbers maintain their existence without homes, shifting from place to place at the dictates of the demand for labor, as for example, in the lumber woods, the harvest fields and other seasonal occupations. Home Missions attempt to send the ministry of the Gospel to these peoples.

5. **Immigrants.** For those who have not yet learned the language and the customs of the United States—and these number millions—there is need of special ministry.

6. **Other classes and groups**, such as Orientals, Hebrews and Mormons are ordinarily slightly touched, if at all, by the regular activities of the Church. Here Home Missions furnish the agency for contacts with Evangelical Christianity.

C

The agencies which Home Missions use to discharge its responsibilities are:

1. **The Missionary Board.** The several denominations are variously organized, the prevailing type being a national missionary society with co-ordinated state and city societies, which place their representatives in the States and Districts to supervise the granting of aid to local churches and institutions and to place personal agents of these boards in the various fields for carrying on home missionary service. A considerable portion of this work is done through local churches and other organizations, but to some extent aggressive approach is made directly to definite groups of people by the commissioned workers of the boards, serving as evangelists, teachers, Sunday School organizers and other workers.

2. **The Church.** The Church is introduced into new communities by the agents of the mission boards, who gather the people together or respond to the call of people who have themselves assembled and join the resources of the mission board with those of the community in erecting buildings and supporting ministers of the Gospel. In some communities, this means the formation of churches, which churches after a few years, become self-supporting and strong allies of the Church Universal. Particularly is this true in city communities. In other places it involves continued assistance, or support, by the central missionary organizations.

3. **The School.** Christian education is considered under another division, but Home Missions take the Christian school to many groups, which otherwise would not have it. To some extent the State has not yet provided even primary education for certain groups. Among these the missionary school is established. Again, for the training of Christian workers, schools of the church are set up and supported by the Home Mission agencies. These schools afford Christian interpretation and direction for our current social trend in racial relationship, industry, politics, community organization and social life.

4. **Literature.** Home Missions provide for the circulation of the Bible, entire or in parts, in 770 languages; also tracts and other Christian literature, including periodicals in the major languages and many of the dialects used in Europe and Asia, as well as in the Americas, to the number of 38.

5. **Institutions for the relief of human needs.** Home Missions aid local communities and groups by providing hospitals, orphanages, homes for the aged, and other institutions of mercy and relief. Social settlements, institutional churches and agencies of ministry to less favored communities are also provided, in which well ordered homes, right social relations and practical Christian conduct are made matters of demonstration by cultivated Christian residents as well as by employed workers.

6. **Personal ministration, special groups and needs.** There are special groups, who are in particular need of religious ministration. Chaplains and visitors are provided for hospitals, prisons and other agencies both public and private, and for the homes of the needy, visitors and nurses are furnished. Ministers and social workers are commissioned to serve migrant workers in harvest fields, lumber camps and canneries. Grants are made to United States chaplains in the army and navy to provide for the special needs of enlisted men, in the name of the churches.

D

Comity, cooperation and mutual helpfulness among the denominations are fostered by the Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions, in which organizations are represented sixty-three Boards and Societies of twenty-eight denominations. Through contacts established by these organizations the particular Board is informed of the best processes, guarded against pitfalls, and inspired to greater activity; also overlapping is discouraged and to a considerable extent prevented in large and increasing areas, and some enterprises are financed and manned cooperatively. Significant instances of this form of cooperation are found in Santo Domingo, where five Boards began and conduct work as one; in Porto Rico, where ten denominations observe agreements respecting territory, maintain one Seminary for the training of native preachers and workers, publish one evangelical paper, hold common conferences and combine in all practical ways. Throughout all parts of the United States and its dependencies, in states and in communities, denominations and churches are manifesting the cooperative spirit, and the evils of sectarianism are vanishing in the practical operation of the New Home Missions.

There are numerous organizations, independent of direct Church control, yet cooperating with the Church in Home Missions, which render specific services, such as the American Bible Society, and affiliated branches, the American Tract Society, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, and many other similar bodies and movements.

III. FOREIGN MISSIONS

1. The Compelling Need of the Foreign Mission Enterprise.

The obligation resting upon the Christian Church to convey the message of its Founder to men of all nations is inherent in the very nature of that Gospel. The love and mercy of God in Christ Jesus cannot be fully understood and accepted by the individual except as a universal love, an offer of mercy to all men. From the very first this was thoroughly understood in the Apostolic Church as was shown by Peter's sermon at Pentecost, and later was more convincingly expounded and illustrated by St. Paul. This led to the extremely rapid spread of Christianity in the first centuries. Subsequently it was obscured for hundreds of years, but brought out into light again in the great movement by which all Europe was evangelized and became the basis for world-wide conquests. It was not until the Nineteenth Century that the modern Church in Europe and North America once again seized this commanding idea, and the great movement of world-wide missionary endeavor was set going.

To-day the Church in the main seats of Evangelical Christendom is being roused afresh to the immeasurable scope of its task. It is undertaking nothing less than establishing the Kingdom of God effectively over and in the life of all races. If human society can be preserved by religion only, and if the only religion adequate to the task is the Gospel of Christ, it follows that the extension of the gospel must be pressed at all cost, even to the utmost personal and ecclesiastical sacrifices. The foreign missionary enterprise has become since the Great War more clearly than ever before the effort of the living Christ through His own people on earth to save the world for which He died.

It is our duty to see with open eyes and prayerful spirits the correlation of this task of the Church with the various social and world forces amid which it is carried on. Each of these can be only briefly stated. They are all familiar enough individually, but the conspectus called for by this Committee may prove valuable.

(1) It is essential to the fullest life of the "Home Churches" that this should be a basic element in their Christian consciousness. To neglect it is to deny Christ as Saviour of the world, and to starve the life of those who ignore it.

The Churches must be aroused to see the meaning of the purpose of God in Christ that the worship and kingdom and will of God should be established "as in heaven so on earth." This being accepted as the definite will of their beloved Lord, they will learn to envisage it as the world's only conceivable hope and bestir themselves to share with Him, in a great passion of devotion, the price of victory even in utmost sacrifice.

(2) Fuller knowledge of the stupendous nature of the task of winning the world to Christ is now before us. The difficulty of transferring the basis of faith, thought, worship, family and social life from the religious beliefs and customs of age-long oriental civilizations to the

principles of Christianity appears more clearly to-day than ever before. Without God it is impossible. The work of creating a Christian civilization among primitive races of the earth is no less a challenge to the faith and zeal of Christians. Two outstanding facts have become clearer in recent years. The first is that the modern missionary must study deeply and even sympathetically the true values of the religions of the people to whom he goes. The Apostolic missionaries worked in a familiar world. They personally understood the values of the religions they had given up for the greater gifts of God in Christ.

The second fact is that the "native" Church should be led to become self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating as rapidly as possible. The dangers of hurry are far less than the dangers of delay. Too much faith cannot be placed in the presence and power of the Spirit of Christ in these new communities. Wherever this faith in Him and in men has been exercised from the days of Paul in Galatia to our own, the results have justified the practice. The missionaries and perhaps still more the Missionary Boards have been far too fearful of evil consequences. "Better soon than late," when it is a matter of faith in Christ's control of His own. The Home Church must be educated to see this problem as a spiritual one, as an element in the ever wise and triumphant statesmanship of faith. This can be used to arouse their own faith, and to call forth still greater gifts of money and life to engage in so thrilling an enterprise of human courage and divine enthusiasm.

(3) The very success of evangelistic work in the missionary field is creating, as it always has in the past, a keen interest in the social aspects of the Church's influence. The demand for Christian "social service" in the guidance of movements of the most revolutionary kind in the social life, customs and industries, alike of African tribes and of great communities in India and China, is attracting the intense devotion of many minds in all Christian circles. No limits can be assigned to this great challenge. But here again, there is deep need for careful study and correlation of the most vital kind. The continued success of the Church's social influence has always depended on the strong maintenance of its fundamental and central work, which consists in enthusiastic evangelism and persistent nourishment of the devotional life of the Christian community, in the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments.

In Christendom these different elements of the Christian life and task spring out freely, spontaneously, from many centres. The peculiar responsibility of the foreign missionary enterprise is that it has to direct these elements wisely and effectively. This it is which again demands gifts of statesmanship as well as faith and vision that the new Churches may be guided and not coerced, that the true relation of the Church's evangelistic and social tasks in each land may be discovered and realized.

(4) This principle applies to the great field of education. It would be easy and tempting for Christian missionary agencies to meet the demands in all missionary lands for secular education by neglecting the distinctive religious basis. Deep study is needed here again in order to correlate the Church's resources in money and workers with this wider view of education. It is the task of the Church to see that a religious,

Christian basis is laid for the development of indigenous education, and not to undertake the full burden of these.

(5) This is rendered all the more imperative for an enterprise which proceeds from Western civilization, because so many other influences are flowing from Europe and America over the world. Western science and commerce are essentially materialistic in their effect, when they are poured in upon the life of Asia and Africa more rapidly and widely than is the Gospel message. Again, the Church and its leaders must feel a burden of nothing less than awful mass and weight.

(6) The Church of Christ is the supreme witness in the world to the spiritual unity of mankind, and to the obligation of the moral laws as resting equally upon all races and all classes of men in their relation to one another. Hence, in its missionary endeavor, the Church must include the support and encouragement of all international, governmental movements to promote the general well-being, the mutual respect, and the peaceful intercourse and cooperation of all races and all nations.

(7) All the correlations above specified and defined imply that, within its own life, the missionary Church of Christ will seek to promote mutual understanding and the fullest possible cooperation between all the various denominations, both at home, and in the vast regions of missionary labor.

2. The Beginnings of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise Among the Churches of North America

To the above general statement concerning Foreign Missions, we add a brief account of the progress made by the denominations in America in their attempt to meet their responsibility in the Foreign Missionary Movement. No attempt has been made to deal with the problems of Foreign Missions as they exist in the mission fields. These problems of Christian Missions as they are found in the Mission fields concern the Church in other Home Base countries as well as in America; if they were to be presented, the report would have to be prepared by a commission made up of representatives of all the countries participating in the Conference on Life and Work and not simply by the American Section.

From the very outset of American history the early settlers gave expression to their missionary spirit. The first three ministers of the Massachusetts Company were bound by their written contracts, dated April, 1629, "to do their endeavor to further the conversion of the savages." In November, 1646, the General Court at Boston made formal provision for sending two ministers each year "to make known the heavenly council of God among the Indians." This was perhaps the second missionary organization in Protestant Christendom. In that same year John Eliot preached his first sermon in the Indian tongue. Two years earlier Thomas Mayhew began a work for the aborigines on Martha's Vineyard, which continued from father to son for five generations, until 1803. The reports of these enterprises sent back to the mother country secured help in the support of the work. This interest in the evangelization of the Indians was somewhat dulled by the hardships and hatreds of frontier pioneering, yet the continuing loyalty of the noblest among the colonists is well illustrated in the careers of such

men as David Brainerd and Jonathan Edwards about the middle of the Eighteenth Century.

The Organized Work for Indians. At a relatively early date American Christians organized societies of their own, partly for the evangelization of the Indians, partly for the sake of giving Christian institutions to the pioneer settlements. The Moravians led off in this work in 1734. The New York Missionary Society was organized in 1796 by ministers and laymen from the Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed and Baptist Churches. In 1798 the vigorous Missionary Society of Connecticut was established. These and other domestic missionary societies planned "to Christianize the heathen in North America and to support and promote Christian knowledge in the new settlements in the United States." By 1807 they were found in each well organized eastern state.

The Work Among the Negroes. This work began with the first negroes who were brought to America as slaves. It was mainly the expression of the interest and sense of responsibility of plantation owners, assisted by the parish clergy. In Virginia there is a record of the Christian baptism of negroes four years after the first negroes were introduced into the colony. The work was so continuous and general that when the negroes were emancipated fully one-half were enrolled baptized members of the Protestant denominations and the remainder had been brought under the influence of the preaching of the gospel.

Missions to Non-Christians in Other Lands. The beginnings of foreign missions in America are connected with the evangelistic movement, which was awakened by the eloquent and evangelical preaching of George Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards in the first half of the Eighteenth Century and rekindled by the great religious leaders of its closing decade and later. These were encouraged and heartened by the message being received regarding the missionary movement in Europe. The missionary enthusiasm of the Moravians in Herrnhut after 1722, the appointment of William Carey in 1792, and the formation of the great missionary and Bible societies in Britain before 1800 aroused great interest in America. The stories of these activities were widely distributed through tracts and articles in papers and monthly magazines. Between 1800 and 1805 four influential missionary magazines were founded in New York City and in New England.

One speedy result of this increasing contact with the rising tide of missionary activity in the mother country was the collection of funds to be sent to Europe to assist these new missionary enterprises. In 1807 over six thousand dollars were sent for Carey's work in India alone. In that same year Andover Theological Seminary was founded to become a noteworthy center and source of missionary zeal.

The age of revival with its noble, fine-spirited leadership had a profound effect in the homes of the people. Many a godly woman, like the mother of Samuel J. Mills, the Williams College student whose devotion and capableness opened the way for the formation of the American Board, dedicated at least one of her sons to missionary service. Mills went to Williams College in 1806 fresh from the experience of a revival in his own neighborhood. He took his missionary passion with him.

Out of the famous "hay-stack" compact in August, 1806, grew the Society of Brethren which for sixty years at Andover contributed a succession of outstanding missionary leaders of capacity, heroism and faith.

Moravian Foreign Missions. To the Moravian Community at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, belongs the credit of having formed the first foreign missionary organization in North America. In 1745, in the third year after settlement, they organized an American Branch of the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel Among the Heathen. This Society in 1746 sent out two missionaries to South America. They were the first American-born missionaries to be sent to a foreign mission field. During the period of 1746 to 1812 this Society sent to the foreign mission field seventeen American-born missionaries, to such widely divergent countries as the Guianas in South America, the West Indies, and Egypt. Many others who were not American-born were also sent out by this Society. During this same period the Moravians kept up an active work among the American Indians.

The Organization of the American Board. In 1810 the General Associations of Congregational Churches in Massachusetts and Connecticut organized the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. This was brought about by the challenge of a small group of students at the Andover Seminary: Mills, Judson, Newell and Nott. By 1812 the needed funds had been secured and the first five missionaries of the newly organized Board sailed for India. Within the first twenty-five years of the Board's existence missions were opened in India, in the Sandwich Islands, in the Levant, in China, in Persia, in Siam, in Africa and among the Indians of North America.

In 1814 Judson and Rice, having changed their views regarding baptism, withdrew from the control of the Board. This led the Baptist churches of America to organize the General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions (incorporated in 1846 as the American Baptist Missionary Union) to provide for their support.

For some years the Congregational churches, the three groups of Reformed churches and the Presbyterian churches were united in the support of the American Board, but eventually the feeling developed that, as long as denominations existed, the foreign mission work could best be carried on by recognizing and utilizing denominational loyalty. In 1819 the Methodist Society was organized; in 1820 the Protestant Episcopal; in 1833 the Old School Presbyterians adopted the Western Foreign Missionary Society which had been established by the Synod of Pittsburgh. Four years later this developed into the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. The organization of other similar Boards took place in the years that followed. To-day there is no denomination which does not have its own Foreign Mission Board or agency through which work is carried on in one or more fields. Also there are a number of independent non-denominational organizations which draw their support from the members of the several denominations.

3. The Growth of The American Foreign Missionary Movement.

The Summary for 1843. The first attempt to make a summary of the progress of American Foreign Missions was printed in 1844 in the "History of Evangelical Missions" by Andrew A. Smith. This summary, which was based on the reports for the year 1843, shows that in that year the American churches were represented on the foreign mission field by 892 missionaries, at work in 202 different stations, caring for 29,882 communicants. There were 713 schools with 33,876 pupils enrolled. The income of all American Societies for that year was \$515,087. The author of this volume frankly acknowledges the incompleteness of his records, but his summary is the only one available.

Statistics of 1898. The statistics prepared for the Ecumenical Missionary Conference, held in New York in 1900, show that on the basis of the reports for the year 1898 there were in the mission field 5,009 missionaries from America; 422,833 communicants were reported; there were 5,082 schools with 257,000 pupils enrolled; and the income of the Missionary Societies was over \$6,500,000.

Statistics of 1908. The statistics prepared for the World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910, showed that, according to reports for 1908, there were in the mission field 6,832 missionaries from America; 674,458 communicants were reported and 369,700 scholars were enrolled in the schools maintained by the American Missionary Societies. The total income for all these societies was over \$10,000,000.

Reports for 1912. The statistics published in the year 1914, based on the records for 1912, report 11,342 missionaries and an income of over \$15,000,000.

The Present Position. The report based on the returns for the year 1921 shows that the number of missionaries had increased to 16,574 and the income to \$38,671,000. The detailed statistics¹ for the year 1921 are as follows:

	Canada	United States	Total
Total Income	\$1,956,753	\$38,671,158	\$40,627,911
Foreign Staff	1,072	16,574	17,646
Native Staff	1,379	72,215	73,594
Communicants	21,898	1,373,477	1,395,373
Other Baptized Christians	17,645	779,640	797,285
Under Instruction for Baptism	8,912	515,719	524,631
Total Enrollment in Schools of all Grades	12,836	716,738	729,574
Hospitals	28	440	468
Dispensaries	22	588	610
Total Treatments	310,392	4,432,072	4,742,468
Native Contributions for Church Work.....	\$165,944	\$5,616,228	\$5,782,172

The Boards and Societies of Canada and of the United States are carrying on missions in the following countries:

¹It should be pointed out that, although the term "Foreign Missions," as used in the United States, is applied in general to missions to non-Christians, the statistics given here include the work which some denominations carry on in Christian countries. With the data at our disposal it is impossible to distinguish between the two types of missionary work. Many of the societies engaged in mission work carry on both home and foreign missions; and the work in Christian countries, if accurately described, would be known as "Home Mission Work" using the term "Home Missions" in the sense of "Inner Missions."

China, India, Burma and Ceylon, Japan, Chosen, Formosa, French Indo-China, Siam, Federated Malay States, Persia, Anatolia, Arabia, Armenia, Cyprus, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria, Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Tunis, Abyssinia, Eritrea, Kenya Colony, Nyassaland, Portuguese East Africa, Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Angola, Belgian Congo, Camerouns, French Equatorial Africa (French Congo), French Shari-Chad, French West Africa, Gold Coast, Liberia, Nigeria, Rio Muni, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Natal, Orange Free State, Swaziland, Transvaal, Mexico, British Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Salvador, Bahamas, Cuba, Haiti, Jamaica, Porto Rico, Santo Domingo, Lesser Antilles, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, British Guiana, Chile, Columbia, French Guiana, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Borneo, Caroline Islands, Celebes, Cook Island, Fiji Islands, Guan, Java, Marshall Islands, New Guinea, New Hebrides, New Zealand, Norfolk Island, Papua, Philippine Islands, Pitcairn Islands, Samoan Islands, Sarawak Islands, Society Islands, Solomon Islands, Sumatra, Tasmania, Tonga Island. Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, Sweden.

4. The Causes of This Growth.

Many causes have made possible the expansion of the missionary movement in America. In the judgment of the Commission any explanation of the progress of the American missionary movement will include what is here set down. A chronological order is followed as far as possible, but the influences and forces have acted and reacted on each other in such a way as to make accuracy impossible.

The Monthly Concert of Prayer for Missions. At a very early period the custom developed of holding in congregations each month a meeting for "prayer for missions." The practice became very widespread and influential. These meetings quickened the interest of Church members in missions to non-Christians, stimulated larger contributions for missions and an increasing volume of prayer by individual Christians, and promoted the dedication of the children of many homes to foreign missionary service.

The Interest and Activity of the Women. From the very beginning of the days of foreign missionary interest, devoted women organized for missionary giving. In 1860 the first woman's foreign missionary society, the Woman's Union Missionary Society of America, was organized. Like the American Board it was an interdenominational organization. The same reasons which caused the ecclesiastical organizations to create their own Foreign Mission Boards and Societies led within the decade to the organization of several denominational women's societies. The work of these societies has resulted in a general diffusion of missionary information and in a great increase in the number of both men and women who are vitally interested in foreign missions. Missionary magazines, pamphlets and books are found in greater quantities in the homes of the Church members, and the prayer life is enriched. The local societies have as their goal reaching every woman in every parish. As a part of the advance the Women's Boards have developed and conducted with great success numerous summer schools for foreign missions for the training of the leaders in the various denominations.

The Influence of Evangelistic Movements during the Nineteenth Century. Reference has been made elsewhere to the influence of the evangelistic movements of the Eighteenth Century on the beginnings of the foreign mission movement in America. No estimate of the growth and expansion of the foreign mission movement can be made without taking into consideration the influence of the similar evangelistic movements during the Nineteenth Century.

In the period (1834-1848) preceding the war between the States, Charles G. Finney was the leader in the evangelistic movement. From

about 1870 to 1900 Dwight L. Moody was the outstanding evangelist. Neither Finney nor Moody consciously engaged in promoting foreign missions, but they saw men everywhere in need of the gospel of Christ and those who came under the influence of the evangelistic movements which they led were inspired by the same passion. Their messages led men and women to the needy places in both Christian and non-Christian lands.

In the judgment of some students of the work of Moody, he, more than any other leader of his time, was instrumental in creating a new sense of the stewardship of wealth, and through the influence which he exerted on ministers and laymen there was a wide dissemination of the ideals of Christian stewardship with regard to lives as well as to possessions.

The Missionary Movement Among Students. The Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, originating in 1886, was an expression of student missionary zeal which was the natural outcome of Mr. Moody's appeals for sacrificial service. It was primarily concerned with securing volunteers for foreign missionary service, but very early in its history it began to promote the study of missions by students, a phase of its work which grew rapidly. The students who had thus become interested in foreign mission study not only returned to their homes from the colleges and universities to initiate the study of missions among the young people in the churches and Sunday schools, but those who became Volunteers by their appeals greatly increased the interest in missions among the young people of every denomination. The conferences and quadrennial conventions of the Volunteer Movement became occasions for the promotion and permanence of this interest in foreign missions. Large numbers of young men and women (chiefly of the student class) dedicated their lives to foreign missions as their life work. Those who could not go to the mission field became the leaders of the work at home.

The Foreign Missions Conference of North America. In 1892 the officers of Foreign Mission Boards met in conference for the first time. This was the beginning of an uninterrupted series of annual meetings of far-reaching influence. No other agency has done more than this Conference to make widely available to all mission agencies ample information concerning methods and programs used somewhere successfully. Its annual meetings have contributed to the improvement of organized mission work. There has been produced a leadership which is better trained and more effective.

The Ecumenical Conference in New York in 1900. This great gathering was projected and carried through by the Foreign Missions Conference, and very powerfully influenced the foreign missionary movement in America. Attended by more than three thousand delegates, who represented the leadership of the different denominations, its quickening influence was immediately felt in all churches. Through the numerous conventions and conferences that followed in denominational centers missions were brought to the attention of the Christian people of America in a way which developed a fresh understanding and acceptance of their responsibility for the extension of Christ's Kingdom.

The Widespread Study of Missions in All Denominations. During the years 1897 to 1899 the study of missions in organized classes was gradually extended from educational institutions to congregations. In 1900 this movement took organized form. The Women's Missionary Societies formed a Central Committee for the united study of Foreign Missions. In 1902 the Young People's Missionary Movement (since 1907 known as the Missionary Education Movement) was created to promote missionary intelligence among young people's societies. From this time on the study of missions spread very rapidly through all the denominations. It soon became an established part of the program of every denomination and reached almost every congregation. Hand in hand with it has gone an effective emphasis on systematic and proportionate giving.

The Laymen's Missionary Movement. The year 1906 witnessed the inception of this great organization which enlisted the laymen in the missionary program of the church as never before. Through literature, through small group meetings and in largely attended conventions for men, held in all parts of Canada and the United States, the message of the obligation of Christian laymen for the evangelization of the non-Christian world brought to them a deepened conviction of responsibility for the prompt extension of missionary endeavor.

The World Missionary Conference. The influence of this great Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 was felt all over Canada and the United States. Every type of activity in the interest of missions to non-Christians became more intense. The epochal gathering deepened the conviction of Christians concerning the Missionary enterprise and created a new sense of responsibility for the unevangelized world.

Forward Movements. Within the last decade has come a mighty effort of the churches to plan an adequate meeting of the situation in non-Christian lands. Nearly every important denomination has organized and pushed a "forward movement" which has greatly increased the regular giving to missions of its constituency. Such mass programs invariably experience some reaction, but the net advance is marked.

The Social Program of Missions. One important reason for this increase of interest and generosity is the emphasis now laid upon the humanitarian, economic and national phase of mission influence. Missions come to the church people of today not only with the purely religious emphasis of the past century, but also with an urgency growing out of the reconstruction and readjustment of civilization, which the mission enterprise develops. The realization of these needs and opportunities brings missions home to every one.

Other Causes. Among other potent influences bearing upon the growth of the missionary enterprise in North America the new emphasis laid by theological institutions upon the training of pastors for missionary leadership should not be overlooked. No other single factor is of greater value in the promotion of an interest in missions by a congregation or by a group of them than a pastor who is himself an intelligent and able interpreter of mission facts.

The general advance during the past generation in the population of North America, the steady increase in church membership and the remarkable expansion in the resources directed by men of Christian character and training has been partly accompanied by a similar increase in gifts to benevolence. In the fruitage of this expansion missions have had an important share.

5. Hindrances to Progress of Foreign Mission Movement to be Faced in America.

The foreign missionary movement in America faces many difficult and perplexing problems at the Home Base. These are not peculiar to North America; other lands may face even more and greater hindrances to their planning. But, if our own Boards are to carry forward the missionary enterprise even on the present scale, to say nothing of making a worthy enlargement of activity in the future, these among other hindrances must be deliberately faced.

The Form of Organization of our Foreign Mission Agencies. As indicated above the missionary response of the past century has been more and more along denominational lines. The Boards and Societies are organized as a part of the denominational machinery and are seriously affected by denominational differences and difficulties. The denominational spirit involves both advantage and hindrance to foreign mission work. To continue to utilize its enthusiasm and its readiness to follow leadership and yet to avoid its rivalries and ambitions constitutes a real problem.

The Rapid Increase of Wealth. The very prosperity of our people, which has made possible large expansions of the missionary program, constitutes also a genuine hindrance. Those who increase in wealth, as our Lord predicted, have the greatest difficulty in holding fast to their ideals and obligations. A spirit of materialism tends to develop, against which there must always be a struggle by those who uphold ideals.

The Rise of Other Agencies of Benevolence. The benevolent tendencies generated by foreign missionary appeals and fostered by foreign missionary leaders are exploited by other agencies, both deserving and undeserving. In some denominations the impulse to larger giving called out by the foreign missionary appeal has been diverted from foreign missionary work, so that the increase in the gifts to foreign missions in that denomination has not been proportionate to the total increase in the gifts of its constituency.

Our National Legislation. The strongly nationalistic trend of much legislation in the National Congress at Washington with reference to immigration and citizenship and the position taken by the United States with reference to our participation in the difficulties growing out of the World War have affected with some seriousness our national sense of foreign mission responsibility.

Conceptions of the Wealth of America. The general impression of the rest of the world concerning the unlimited resources of Americans has induced a rapid increase in the number of appeals to the benevolence of our people for all forms of relief especially for physical relief in all parts of the world. This multiplicity of calls has resulted in confusing

their minds and in turning their attention away from the needs of foreign missions. It creates often an unfortunate attitude among the churches as to appeals which come from the mission field.

Misapprehensions of Church People. Our missionary machinery as now organized seems often unable to project into the hearts and minds of church people an understanding of the real conditions and needs of the mission field which keeps them alive to their obligations. Sometimes the approach of a Board is hindered or blocked by the lack on the pastor's part of world vision and courage. Sometimes it is prevented by over-insistence on a policy which apparently equalizes the opportunity of each Board but really shuts off all freedom of approach.

A notable feature of the missionary enterprise, both home and foreign, today is its candid self-criticism. Less is said against it by its adversaries than by its advocates. There should be and there are great gains from this, but there is also the possibility of great loss. And perhaps our greatest present need is for a bursting forth of faith and power which will throw all our introspective and camp-fire discussions into the background and issue in bold and positive action. This action may take many forms. It may take the form of a fearless, rational declaration of the facts and truths of Christianity addressed to the intelligence and conscience of our day. It may take the form of deeds of mercy and love by which the Christian spirit will address itself to the practical relief of human suffering and need. It may take the form of courageous declaration of good will and trust across gulfs of class or nation or race, which many influences are seeking to deepen and to perpetuate. It may take the form of fearless demand that accepted economic or social ideas shall surrender to the mind of Christ with which they are at war. Whatever the form of action, whether intellectual or practical, it is action which is needed.

The missionary work of the Church is not finished. The Gospel is not preached to every creature at home or abroad. The work which Christ alone can do but cannot do alone is undone for the want of men who will put themselves in His hands for His untrammelled use. Public teachers are condemning society to subjection to its primary and natural animal urges because they have no contact with the great spiritual forces which demonstrate the reality of the supernatural urge of Christ in the human soul. It is quite clear that reasoned unbelief is firmly set against the gospel, that many interests in many lands will steadfastly resist it, that indifference and lukewarmness and the love of evil abound. But these were the circumstances of the gospel's birth. They have been its familiar conditions through all the centuries. They are its opportunity today. The Church's obligation is perpetually to challenge and destroy or to convert and transform every influence which questions or obstructs the supremacy of Christ as the world's Lord and Saviour.

Christianity began as a living movement. Its course across the Roman Empire has been truly described by Professor Harnack as its "expansion." It had from the first its reflective elements. It has them now. And there is place in it for the work of the student of its ideas and its history and the critic of its modes of action. But it needs now

as ever the awakening of spiritual energy, the apologetic power of missionary advance and conquest, men who will preach Christ to men and nations, and declare His authority over human hearts and the human heart, over individuals and society, over persons and the springs of life. It is time for the trumpets to sound again and for the army which has long enough lain about the camp-fire discussing the mistakes of the past and the outline of the ideal campaign, to strike its tents and rise for a great march.

IV

RECRUITING FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE AT HOME AND ABROAD

God's purpose for the world can only be realized through men and women who have dedicated themselves to this task. There is no other way. Periods of growth and progress in the Kingdom of God are always associated with the names of great leaders. Periods of dearth and lack of progress are periods with which no great leaders' names are associated. No question before the Church today is more vital than that of recruiting capable men and women for the leadership of the Church. What the Church is at present and will be in the future depends upon its leadership.

Jesus acted on this principle. In the beginning of his ministry he began to select and call men to whom his leadership was to be committed after his death. To His disciples he set forth the principles which should underly their efforts to secure leaders for the work of the Church. "When He saw the crowds He was moved with compassion for them," they were harassed and dejected "like sheep without a shepherd." Then He said to His disciples, "Lift up your eyes and look upon the fields, the harvest is ripe; so pray the Lord of the harvest that He send laborers into his harvest."

Since then the Church has secured its leaders by applying the principles which He taught and practiced. Methods and details have varied but the underlying principles are those which he used. All through the years attempts to build up the leadership of the Church through the use of methods and schemes, not based on His principles, have resulted in spurious leadership, bringing death and agony.

Interpreting these principles, the following essential factors appear to be necessary, if leadership of the right kind is to be produced within the Church:

(1) There must be a study of God's purpose for the world and the Church's obligation in the light of this purpose. Young men and young women cannot dedicate themselves to any great work until they know what that work is, and the demands it will make upon them.

(2) But knowledge is not enough. Knowledge of conditions alone never produces a spiritual leader, "Christ saw the multitudes and he was moved with compassion," and His disciples must in some measure share that experience. If they do not there will be no irresistible urge to take up the responsibilities of this work.

(3) There must be created the conditions necessary for the birth of spiritual visions and purposes. These conditions can only exist and be effective as a result of prayer on the part of the Church. Spiritual leaders are born where fervent prayer is a force in the lives of those who create the atmosphere of the home and of the parish.

(4) Men and women must be called of God to the work to which they dedicate themselves. The lord of the harvest must thrust forth the laborers. The laborers are sent to gather in not "a" harvest but "His" harvest. It is God's kingdom in which they are called to be leaders.

A study of the problem of recruiting leadership in any adequate way requires the consideration of the whole religious development of the childhood and youth and the environment in which the child lives at successive periods. Space does not permit an extended treatment of this part, but we mention the following:

(1) **The power and influence of the Christian home:** A study of the lives of a large number of missionaries, who have led the missionary movement during the last century, shows that with the exception of only a few, the outstanding leaders in our missionary movement were brought up in Christian homes.

(2) **The influence of the parish and Church:** The pastor touches the life of his young people much more than any other person. The influence of Sunday school teachers and other active workers in the congregation is great. Young people's societies, the visits of returned missionaries, the Bible and mission study classes, all help.

(3) **The influence of the school** during childhood and early adolescence is not to be discounted.

(4) **The influence of the college and university** may be even greater. Experience shows that, although the majority of young men and young women have reached some conclusion as to their life work before reaching college, it is usually during the college period that their decisions are crystallized.

(5) The influence of conventions and conferences for young people is perhaps most effective for recruiting purposes.

Training Agencies: A program of recruiting leaders for the Christian Church must include adequate provision for training of the recruits for their life work. To meet this requirement there have been established in each Christian communion theological seminaries and training schools, which provide for the training necessary.

Recruiting Agencies: A realization of the necessity of recruiting leaders has brought into being a number of recruiting agencies in North America. Some of these agencies are voluntary organizations, and have no official relationship to the different denominations; others have been organized by the denominations themselves. The young people's societies, both denominational and interdenominational, carry on recruiting work among their constituency. The student Christian Associations have given considerable attention to securing recruits for all forms of Christian service.

The Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions is, perhaps, the most successful voluntary agency for securing recruits for foreign missionary service. It had its origin among students who had definitely decided to become foreign missionaries. From this beginning the Movement has continued to grow. The reports show that, since the origin of the Movement at Mt. Hermon, Massachusetts, in 1886, over 10,300 recruits for foreign missionary service enrolled by the Movement have been accepted by the different North American Foreign Missionary Boards, and sent to the missionary field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evangelistic Methods:

- Pastoral and Personal Evangelism, by Charles L. Goodell.
- Pastor and Evangelist, by Charles L. Goodell.
- Individual Work For Individuals, by H. Clay Trumbull.
- Present-Day Evangelism, by J. W. Chapman.
- The Method of the Master, by George Clark Peck.

The Evangelistic Message:

- Things Fundamental, by Charles Edward Jefferson.
- What Does Christianity Mean? By W. H. P. Faunce.
- The Main Points, by Charles Reynolds Brown.
- What It Means to Be a Christian, by Edward I. Bosworth.

Home Missions:

- Types of City Churches, by H. Paul Douglass. Doran (forthcoming).
- The Challenge of the City, by Josiah Strong. Missionary Education Movement, 1911.
- Foreigners or Friends, by Thos. Burgess (et al). Foreign-Born Americans Division, Dept. of Missions, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, 1921.
- Handbook-Bibliography on Foreign Language Groups in the United States and Canada, by Amy Blanche Green and Fk. A. Gould. Missionary Education Movement, 1925.
- The Church and the Immigrant, by Georgia E. Harkness. Doran, 1921.
- Peasant Pioneers, by Kenneth D. Miller. Missionary Education Movement, 1925.
- Is Your Latch String Out? By Ruth Walkinshaw. Woman's Press, 1922.
- The Jews in the Making of America, by George Cohen. Stratford Co., Boston, 1924.
- Jews of Today, by Arthur Rupp. Henry Holt and Co., 1913.
- Chinese and Japanese in America (symposium). Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science. Philadelphia, January, 1921.
- American Democracy and Asiatic Citizenship, by Sidney L. Gulick. Scribners, 1914.
- From Over the Border, by Vernon McCombs. Missionary Education Movement, 1925.
- The Near Side of the Mexican Question, by Jay C. Stowell. Doran, 1921.
- A More Christian Industrial Order, by Henry Sloane Coffin. Macmillan, 1920.
- The Church and Industrial Reconstruction. Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Association Press, 1920.
- Christian Ideals in Industry, by F. Ernest Johnson and Arthur E. Holt. Methodist Book Concern, 1924.
- The Town and Country Church in the U. S., by E. de S. Brunner and H. N. Morse. Doran, 1923.
- The Farmer's Church, by Warren H. Wilson. Century, 1925.
- The Southern Highlander and His Homeland, by John C. Campbell. Russell Sage Foundation, 1921.
- The Southern Highlander, by Horace Kephart. Macmillan, 1921.
- The Land of Saddle Bags, by James Watt Raine. Missionary Education Movement, 1924.
- The Foundations of Mormonism, by Wm. Earle La Rue. Revell, 1919.

- The Story of the Mormons, by Wm. A. Linn. Macmillan, 1902.
 The Red Man in the U. S., by G. E. E. Lindquist. Doran, 1923.
 The American Indian on the New Trail, by T. C. Moffet. Missionary Education Movement, 1914.
 Frank Higgins: Trail Blazer, by T. D. Whittles. Missionary Education Movement, 1920.
 The Trend of the Races, by George E. Haynes. Missionary Education Movement, 1922.
 The Basis of Racial Adjustment, by Thomas J. Woofter. Ginn and Co., 1925.
 Roaming Through the West Indies, by H. A. Franck. Century, 1920.
 Through Santo Domingo and Haiti, by Samuel Guy Inman. Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, 1919.
 Alaska, by Ellen Higginson. Macmillan, 1919.
 Alaska, by Jeanette P. Nichols. Arthur G. Clark Co., Cleveland, 1923.
 Alaska: An Empire in the Making, by John J. Underwood. Dodd, Mead & Co., 1925. (New Edition.)
 On the Firing Line, by John M. Somerndike. Westminster Press, 1913.
 Floor Plans for Community Buildings, by Guy Lowell. Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 1920.
 Evangelism in the Remaking of the World, by A. W. Leonard. Abingdon Press, 1919.
 Rural Evangelism, by Chas. Wagner. Methodist Book Concern, 1919.
 The Church in America, by W. Adams Brown. Macmillan, 1922.
 For a New America, by Coe Hayne. Missionary Education Movement, 1923.
 Home Missions Council. Annual Report.
 Christianity and the Race Problem, by J. H. Oldham. Association Press, 1924.
 Of One Blood, by Robert E. Speer. Missionary Education Movement, 1924.
 The Soul of America, by C. L. Thompson. Revell, 1919.
 U. S. Religious Census, 1916.

Foreign Missions:

- Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions, by Harlan P. A. Beach. 2 volumes. 1901. New York: Student Volunteer Movement.
 The World Atlas of Christian Missions, by James S. Dennis, Harlan P. Beach and Charles H. Fahs, editors. 1911. New York: Student Volunteer Movement.
 Encyclopedia of Missions, by Henry Otis Dwight. 1910. 2nd edition. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
 World Statistics of Christian Missions, by Harlan P. Beach and Burton St. John, editors. 1916. New York. Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America.
 World Missionary Atlas, by Harlan P. Beach and Charles H. Fahs, editors. 1925. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research.
 The Centennial History of the American Bible Society, by Henry Otis Dwight. 1916. 2 volumes. New York: Macmillan.
 Ecumenical Missionary Conference. New York. 2 volumes. 1900. New York: American Tract Society.
 Foreign Missions Year Book of North America. 1920 (Annual). New York: Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America.
 The Haystack Centennial. 1907. Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
 World Missionary Conference. The report of the World Missionary Conference in 1910 held in Edinburgh. 9 volumes. 1910. New York: Revell.
 God's Plan for World Redemption, by Charles R. Watson. 1911. Philadelphia: Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church in North America.
 The Life of Wm. Carey, D.D., by George Smith, 1887. London: John Murray.
 The Life of Adoniram Judson, by Edward Judson. 1904. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.
 Samuel J. Mills, by Thomas C. Richards. 1906. Boston: Pilgrim Press.
 The Foreign Missionary, by Arthur J. Brown. 1907. New York: Revell.
 Rising Churches in Non-Christian Lands, by Arthur J. Brown. 1915. New York: Missionary Education Movement.
 A Study of Christian Missions, by William Newton Clarke. 1900. New York: Scribner.
 The Missionary Enterprise, by Edwin M. Bliss. 1908. New York: Revell.
 A Short History of Christian Missions, by George Smith. 1913. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

- The Story of the American Board, by William E. Strong. 1910. Boston: Pilgrim Press.
- Protestant Missions: Their Rise and Early Progress, by Augustus C. Thompson. New York: Scribners.
- Unity and Missions: Can a Divided Church Save the World? By Arthur J. Brown. 1915. New York: Revell.
- The Missionary Obligation in the Light of the Changes in Modern Thought, by Alfred E. Garvie. 1914. Hodder and Stoughton.
- Missions, Their Rise and Development, by Louise Creighton. 1912. New York: Henry Holt.
- The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World, by Edward C. Moore. 1919. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- History of Christian Missions, by Charles Henry Robinson. 1915. New York: Scribner.
- The Church in America, by William Adams Brown. 1922. New York: Macmillan.
- The War and the Religious Outlook. 1920. New York: Association Press.
- A Century of Endeavor, by Julia C. Emery. 1821-1921. Department of Missions. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A., New York.
- Foreign Missions Conference Reports (Annual). Foreign Missions Conference, 25 Madison Avenue, New York.
- History of the Missions of the Moravian Church During the 18th and 19th Centuries, by John Taylor Hamilton, 1901. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Times Publishing Company.
- Historical Sketches of Woman's Missionary Societies. I. Hart and Mrs. L. H. Daggett, editors. 1879. Boston.
- The History of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society, by Archibald McLean. 1919. New York: Revell.
- The Business of Missions, by C. H. Patton. 1924. New York: Macmillan.
- Missions and Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by J. M. Reid and J. T. Gracey. 3 vols. 1895. New York: Eaton and Mains.
- A Brief History of Evangelical Missions, by Andrew M. Smith. Hartford: Robbins.
- A World Book of Foreign Missions, by E. T. Reed. 1924. London: Swarthmore Press.
- God's Missionary Plan for the World, by J. W. Bashford. 1907. New York: Eaton & Mains.
- The Modern Call of Missions, by James S. Dennis. 1913. New York: Revell.
- Christianity and the Progress of Man, by W. Douglas Mackenzie. 1897. New York: Revell.
- Winning the World for Christ: A Study in Dynamics, by Walter Russell Lambuth. 1915. New York: Revell.
- The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions, by John R. Mott. 1910. New York: Student Volunteer Movement.
- The Missionary Motive, W. Paton, Editor. 1913. London: Student Christian Movement.
- World Facts and America's Responsibility, by Cornelius H. Patton. 1919. New York: Association Press.

Printed in U. S. A.
THE GOTHIC PRESS
New York, N. Y.

THE CHURCH AND
ECONOMIC AND INDUSTRIAL
PROBLEMS



American Section
Report of Commission II
to
THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK
HELD IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN
August 19-30, 1925

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

Commission Reports

- I. The Church's Obligation in View of
God's Purpose for the World.
- II. The Church and Economic and Industrial
Problems.
- III. The Church and Social and Moral Prob-
lems.
- IV. The Church and International Relations.
- V. The Church and Education.
- VI. Methods of Co-operative and Federative
Efforts By the Christian Communions.

GENERAL PREFACE

A few words should be written about the inception of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In the summer of 1919 the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches met at The Hague. This was the first meeting of an international character held after the signing of the Armistice, if one excepts a small gathering of labor leaders. About sixty leaders of the Churches were present, representing nearly all the Protestant Communions and most of the countries of Europe. Ten or twelve delegates were present from America.

The meetings at The Hague developed so sweet and reasonable an atmosphere, at a time when great bitterness prevailed everywhere, and the delegates present expressed themselves so strongly as to the un-Christian character of war and the necessity of establishing a world order on a new and Christian basis, that several of the delegates felt strongly that the time had come for the Churches officially to get together and say what these Churchmen semi-officially were saying. As a result Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of America, the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and others held an informal meeting to discuss the possibility of bringing the Churches of the world together for a Conference, where the Churches could utter their united conviction on international matters and all other matters with which society would have to deal in the reconstruction of civilization and the building of a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old, which lay all about them.

This preliminary meeting was not altogether spontaneous for on two separate occasions during the progress of the war, Archbishop Soederblom had communicated with the Churches of Europe and America regarding the possibility of such a conference and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America had suggested that a Conference of the Federated bodies of Churches in all the countries might meet together after the war. The unanimous opinion of the unofficial group at The Hague was that a committee should be appointed to bring the leaders of the Churches together with the aim of convincing them of the necessity of such a world gathering of the Churches, and asking them to take the matter up with their respective denominations. This committee went from The Hague to Paris and brought together as many of the leaders of the Churches as possible upon such short notice. This meeting became greatly interested in the project and requested Dr. Frederick Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenical Conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America to arrange for a preliminary meeting of the Churches the following summer.

Dr. Lynch proceeded from Paris to London and had several interviews with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F. B. Myers, Dr. Thomas Nightingale, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare and others. Meantime, Archbishop Soderbloom undertook to interest the Scandinavian Churches and Dr. Choisy

the Swiss Churches. Sufficient interest was aroused to warrant the calling of a preliminary Conference at Geneva in the summer of 1920.

As a result of the procedures recorded above, one hundred delegates assembled at Geneva in August of 1920. A three days session was held and the Conference gradually began to assume shape. Great interest was manifested and all present expressed themselves to the effect that the Church Universal had a great opportunity to exert a determining influence upon the new order that must follow the war. Furthermore the world was waiting for some great pronouncement from the Churches upon such questions as war and peace, the industrial order; such immediate problems as those having to do with intemperance and vice and upon all ethical and moral questions. It was felt that a positive and commanding utterance of the Churches in these trying years would do much to encourage a disheartened world and would make it much easier for those who were trying to reconstruct the world on a Christian basis to carry on this high task. There was much confusion in the world as to just where the Church did stand on these great problems disturbing the minds of men. The conviction was expressed that only as the rule of life laid down by the gospels became the law of nations could any hope for security and peace be found or the great sores of the world be healed.

Furthermore it was felt by all that whatever new international machinery might be set up or whatever new industrial order might arise, it was only as these were permeated by the spirit of Jesus Christ that they would fulfill the high hopes of their founders. It was also strongly felt that two great blessings might ensue from such a Conference. On the one hand all individual communions would profit by this period of common intercourse, especially those communions that had greatly suffered from the war. They would be made strong in the consciousness of the oneness of all Christ's disciples. On the other hand the coming together, if only for a month, of all the Churches of the world, to cooperate in the common task of redeeming the world order, and to make some great common pronouncement on the place of Christ in our civilization would be a great object lesson to the world.

At Geneva a large International Committee was set up which was divided into four groups, one for America, one for the British Empire, one for the European Protestant churches and the fourth representing the Orthodox Eastern Church. The International Committee appointed a smaller Executive Committee, which held three meetings in successive years, one at Peterborough, England, one at Zurich, Switzerland and one at Amsterdam, Holland. In August, 1922, the International Committee itself met at Helsingborg, Sweden, and was very fully attended by delegates from all the communions and nations. At this meeting the programme for the Conference assumed final shape. It was voted that the program for Stockholm should include the following groups of subjects:

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's purpose for the world.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The reports which followed are in fulfillment of this vote taken at Helsingborg. In April, 1924, the full Committee met again at Birmingham, England, in connection with C. O. P. E. C. and reviewed the progress made upon the reports and dealt specifically with plans for the Stockholm meeting.

This is in brief the history of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and is the explanation of the reports which follow. These reports have been prepared with great care by the leaders of the Churches and by experts in the several questions discussed. They are submitted to the Conference in the hope that the Conference will receive them in the same spirit in which they have been written, i.e. in the endeavor to find the common consciousness of the Churches upon these subjects and to voice its united feeling.

LIST OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chairman

REV. SHAILER MATHEWS, D.D., LL.D.,
Dean of Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Secretary

REV. WORTH M. TIPPY, D.D.
Executive Secretary, Commission on the Church and Social Service, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Members

ALEXANDER, REV. W. W., D.D.
Secretary, Commission on Interracial Cooperation, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

BATTEN, REV. SAMUEL ZANE, D.D.
Secretary, Social Education Department, American Baptist Publication Society.

BOWIE, REV. W. RUSSELL, D.D.
Rector of Grace Church, New York. Member of Department of Christian Social Service, Protestant Episcopal Church.

BRUNNER, REV. EDMUND de S., Ph.D.
Director of Town and Country Surveys, Institute of Social and Religious Research.

CARNER, MISS LUCY P.
Industrial Secretary, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

COLEMAN, W. C.
President, Coleman Lamp Company, Wichita, Kansas.

EDDY, SHERWOOD, LL.D.
Fellowship for a Christian Social Order.

FREY, JOHN P.
Vice-President, International Labor Press Association of America.
Editor, International Molders' Journal.

HARLAN, REV. ROLVIX, D.D.
Head of Department of Sociology and Social Ethics, University of Richmond, Virginia.

HERRING, REV. HUBERT C.
Secretary, Commission on Social Service, National Council of Congregational Churches.

HOLT, REV. ARTHUR E., Ph.D.
Department of Social Ethics, Chicago Theological Seminary.

HOWARD, EARL DEAN, Ph.D.
Labor Manager, Hart Schaffner & Marx.

JOHNSON, REV. F. ERNEST
Director, Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

JOHNSON, MRS. LUKE, G.
Director, Woman's Work, Commission on International Cooperation, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

JONES, BISHOP ROBERT E.
Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church.

- KLING, JAMES W.
General President, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and
Helpers; Editor, Blacksmith's Journal.
- LATHROP, REV. CHARLES N.
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Service, Protestant Episcopal
Church.
- LINGLE, REV. WALTER L., D.D.
Professor of History, Pedagogy and Missions at Union Theological Seminary,
Richmond, Virginia.
- MATHER, SAMUEL
Senior Member of firm Pickands, Mather & Co.
- McCONNELL, REV. FRANCIS J., D.D., LL.D.
Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church.
- McCULLOCH, MISS RHODA
Secretary, National Conference on the Christian Way of Life.
- McDOWELL, REV. JOHN, D.D.
Secretary, Division of Church Extension and Missions, Presbyterian Board of
National Missions.
- MULLAN, REV. JAMES M. B. D.
Executive Secretary, Commission on Social Service and Rural Work, Reformed
Church in the United States.
- PAGE, KIRBY, CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
Fellowship for a Christian Social Order.
- PEABODY, GEORGE FOSTER, LL.D.
Chairman, Penn Normal and Industrial Institute.
- RIPLEY, MRS. IDA S.
- ROBINS, RAYMOND, LL.D.
Lecturer and Social Worker.
- SHEFFIELD, PROFESSOR ALFRED D.
Secretary, Industrial Commission, National Conference on Christian Way of Life.
Professor of Debate, Wellesley College.
- SIMKOVITCH, MRS. MARY K.
Head Worker, Greenwich House, New York.
- SMITH, REV. FRANK A., D.D.
Secretary of Missions, American Baptist Home Missionary Society.
- TAYLOR, REV. ALVA W., D.D.
Secretary, Board of Temperance and Social Welfare, Church of Christ (Disciples).
- TOWSON, CHARLES R.
Deering, Milliken & Co.
- VAN KLEECK, MISS MARY
Director, Department of Industrial Studies, Russell-Sage Foundation.
- WARD, REV. HARRY F., A.M.
Professor, Christian Ethics, Union Theological Seminary; Secretary, Methodist
Federation for Social Service.
- WILSON, REV. WARREN H., D.D., LL.D.
Director, Town and Country Department, National Board of Missions of the
Presbyterian Church.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.

The Economic and Industrial Background and Progress. Economic individualism and political independence coincident—disappearance of the frontier—Intensification of competition—Negro migration to the North—Agricultural conditions—A new era opening—Labor not yet accepted in principle.	1
Progress in Labor Status and Welfare. Advance in welfare of workers—Improved status of workers—Increasing attention to labor management—Growth of work's councils—New appreciation of human factors—Influence of women in industry.	2
Attitude of Organized Religion. Pronouncements following the War—Social Ideals of the Churches—Work of "The Inquiry"—Work of the great denominations—Industrial Conferences by the Federal Council of Churches—The Information Service—The Interchurch World Movement.	4
The Industrial Order in the United States. Difficulty of reporting the judgment of the Christian community—What is meant by the industrial order—Industry characterized by stresses and strains—Statement by the United States Commission on Industrial relations—This statement will be challenged—Large numbers of establishments have no trouble.	7
The Purpose of Industry and the Profit Motive. Common motive is profits—The historic purpose in human needs—Ethical validity of profit questioned—Meaning of the word service—The ideal of stewardship—Economic gulf between the classes.	9
The Competitive System. Competition a motive and a method of selection—Control of prices by Competition—Competition a destructive force—competition a permanent factor—Control by co-operative principle—Labor as a commodity—Labor and the law of supply and demand.	10
Economic Alternatives. The economic order a complex—Can be changed only gradually—Progress by dealing with specific problems over periods of time—Delusion of ultimates—Patterns of economic organization.	11
Collective Bargaining and Arbitration. Not a simple question of right and wrong but a way of action—Statement by Conference on Ethical Forces in Advancing Standards—Tendency away from force by labor unions—Value of voluntary arbitration—Constitutional government in industry growing.	13
The Open Shop Movement. Growth of "The American Plan"—The plan criticized—Criticism of the "Union Shop."	14
Employee Representation. Stimulated by the War—Permanent value and present tendencies—Profit sharing—Has not made much headway in the United States.	15
The Cooperative Movement. Growth in fruit industry—Spiritual influences at work—Significance in farming.	16

Public Ownership in the United States. Mainly in public utilities —Hindered by political control—Growing efficiency—Nationaliza- tion of Mines and railroads—Sentiment unfavorable as a whole.	17
The Opportunity of the Churches. Opposition to entrance of churches into industrial field—Welcomed by progressive employers —Function of the church in industry—Effect of five years of effort—Crusade against the twelve hour day in steel—The great service of the church to give leaders and a “lifting purpose greater than the struggle of materialism”—Passing of the class struggle into the method of the Kingdom of God.....	19
Appendix I. The Social Ideals of the Churches.....	xi
Appendix II. Industrial Government in the Clothing Industry in Chicago.	xii
Bibliography on the Church and Economic and Industrial Prob- lems. The bibliography deals mainly with American publications but includes foreign books largely circulated in the United States.	xiv

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC AND INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS

An account of the relation in the United States of America to the economic and industrial life of the nation must begin with a word concerning the background of the present industrial situation in this country. There is reason to believe that this situation is not fully understood abroad.

The Economic and Industrial Background and Progress

The year 1776 witnessed two events, significant for American history, not commonly thought of as related—the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the publication of Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations." The era of economic individualism which the latter publication ushered in was intensified in America by coincidence with the establishment of a new political state. What happened in England due to the synchronizing of the industrial revolution with the development of a new laissez-faire philosophy of industry and trade was reproduced in America, with the difference that it was greatly enhanced by the natural influence of a pioneer environment and the absence of binding social traditions. Thus, in America, during the Nineteenth Century industry came to be characterized by an excessive individualism, continually reinforced by a beckoning frontier which made it possible for any enterprising individual, whether capitalist or laborer, to push into unexploited fields whenever he became hampered by competition or by restraints imposed by the community. The characteristic American ideal—a spirit of independence and intolerance of restraint, not uncommonly manifesting itself in aggressive non-conformity—is directly related to the fact that our history is that of a new country where the processes of socialization have been slowed down by the aggressiveness and success of individual enterprise.

But since the disappearance of the frontier, a decade or so before the end of the Nineteenth Century, the American industrial system, as it were, turned in upon itself. Competition has grown keener; labor has been inflated by an enormous influx of immigrants and has had to struggle collectively for an adequate share of the product. This struggle has been intensified by a competition of Negro with white labor, and latterly by a reversed tide of agricultural labor from the country to the city. The last two factors have been accentuated by the War, which has brought hundreds of thousands of Negroes into Northern industrial cities and has also greatly lessened the profitableness of farming because of the slackened market abroad for agricultural products, the speculative rise of farm values, and the rises in cost of farm labor and machinery during and immediately following the war. Not only so, but the plight of the farmer has occasioned a marked conflict between rural and

urban labor interests. The country is in conflict with the city. An agrarian political movement has appeared to which certain liberal elements in the labor movement have allied themselves for the advocacy of special legislation, the development of the co-operative movement, the curtailment of corporate privilege and the reorganization of credit, policy.- This movement is however still young and weak, and has been checked by better conditions on the farms and the conservative swing of the election in 1924.

A reversal of our long established immigration policy has enormously cut down the supply of unskilled labor; this may prove to be the most significant recent change in our national life, tending to sharpen the competition for industrial labor and to accelerate still further the stream of farm labor toward the cities.

The developments here sketched have probably ushered in a new era in American industrial life. Yet the adjustment in thought and attitude which they have rendered necessary is as yet backward. Many American business men still cling to that individualism which resulted from boundless resources and unhampered enterprise which no longer exist. New legislation for the protection of labor is still opposed instinctively by most employers. Labor organization has not yet been accepted in principle by most employers although there are large areas of industry where labor relations on a union basis work smoothly and in the main satisfactorily. The trade unions unfortunately do not put before the public sufficiently the constructive side of unionism. The public tends to know only its controversial aspects. It is regarded by many employers as an evil to be avoided if possible, or to be resigned to if necessary and it receives also a considerable public hostility.

Progress in Labor Status and Welfare

The industrial situation in the United States as a whole, however, both at the present time and looked at over a period of years, shows marked progress. Labor organization has greatly increased in numbers and power, and in participation in national affairs. There have been great advances in the wages, living conditions, education, safety and health of the workers. In mining it is not legal in most states to work over eight hours a day, and a network of legal and union safe guards to life and health and for the protection of children and women have grown up. The same is true of the railroads, where due to organization and legislation and to a more considerate policy of administration, the entire service has been lifted within a generation as to hours, wages, home life, moral standards and participation in control. This is also true in most industries. Eight states now have the eight hour day. Fourteen states have minimum wage legislation for women. Most states prohibit the labor of children in non-agricultural pursuits up to fourteen, and surround minors up to sixteen, eighteen and twenty-one with protective restrictions as to hours, night work, educational

requirements, health, safety and morals. The Federal laws of 1916 and 1919 set a minimum standard of fourteen for entrance into factories, a higher age in certain industries, and an eight hour day a forty-eight hour week and prohibition of night work between fourteen and sixteen. The steel industry, which with notable exceptions among the so-called independents, has until recently pursued a backward policy in regard to a long work day, a seven day week and autocratic relations, has nevertheless developed stability in this basic industry and phenomenal achievements in safety, health, education and intelligent community organization. Similar advances have been made in most industries in the matter of safety appliances on moving machinery, lighting, air space, sanitary provisions, and fire hazards. The burden of accidents no longer falls exclusively upon the worker and his family, and increasingly strong industries provide as a part of the system not only against accident, but for sickness and through group insurance against death. One entire industry, the men's garment industry, has introduced a mutual scheme of unemployment insurance, and a number of individual concerns are doing the same, while the states of Wisconsin and Massachusetts are considering state systems of unemployment insurance.

In general it must be said that American industry is now characterized by an increased interest in "morale" and by behaviour on the part of employers which indicates a growing appreciation of the human factor in industrial relations, and the principle of cooperation. The conviction is growing that the hazards of large scale production are bound to increase, that the period of unregulated pursuit of profits has passed and that surety, stability and honest service to the public should be the main objects of effort.

American industry is also in plastic condition allowing exceptional freedom for experimentation, due to the fact that it has not as yet set in moulds as in older and in some respects more advanced industrial nations of Europe. New methods in scientific technique, organization, labor relations and welfare are constantly appearing, and the world may expect advances along fundamentally capitalistic lines, involving important adjustments to social control, as well as experiments of the socialistic type. The organization of the men's garment industry is a bold stroke towards cooperative relations in the form of industrial unionism, and towards the control of both intermittency and unemployment. Under the leadership of the Department of Commerce, the whole problem of the business cycle, seasonal work and other forms of intermittency, are being studied with a view to ultimate control. Many corporations are stimulating the purchase of their stock by employees and the consumers. These are hopeful illustrations of a capitalist society setting about the study and control of its own evils and the perfecting and democratizing of its own organization.

The participation of women in industry was emphasized, though not greatly accelerated by the war, and women's labor organizations are now among the potent factors in the labor movement. The influence

of women upon industrial standards has been greatly augmented by their political enfranchisement. One of the conspicuous recent evidences of this new force in American affairs, is the support by the great national organizations of women of the newly proposed Child Labor Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Favorable action has at last been secured on the part of Congress, and if the amendment is finally ratified by the states the way will be open for control by statute and finally the abolition of this long continued evil. In the development of protective legislation for the workers, women have played an influential part.

The Attitude of Organized Religion

With respect to the attitude of organized religion toward industrial problems it may be said that the American churches have passed through a period of formulating ideals and making pronouncements which have come to be fairly widely known. A recent assembling of such pronouncements disclosed the fact that nearly seventy have been issued in the course of the last decade and a half. Foremost among them, so far as Protestantism is concerned, is the document known as The Social Ideals of the Churches—sometimes referred to as the Social Creed—which was promulgated by the Federal Council of the Churches in 1908, and to which a series of interpretive resolutions was appended in 1919. (Appendix I). In a general way it may be taken as representing liberal Protestant opinion in America, although the need of its revision and extension is recognized. The Roman Catholic Bishops Program of Social Reconstruction, adopted in 1919, is a very important statement on industrial questions. It reflects a change in emphasis from abstract ideals to the dynamics of ethical progress in industry.

There are indications, however, that the interest in mere pronouncement-making is less than formerly. There can be no doubt of the value of the pronouncements that have been made in challenging attention and securing the interest of groups outside the churches who needed some direct evidence that the Church is interested in their problems. These utterances have also encouraged and sustained many a minister who was working single-handed for the recognition of the relation of Christianity to industrial and economic issues. Now, however, we are less interested in anything approximating a formal creed and more interested in specific applications of accepted Christian principles to specific situations. We are more concerned, as was said by a liberal employer "To throw a blazing light on the next steps to be taken." The ideal of a living wage for example, is not considered as clear as it once seemed to be. There is no increased disposition to discredit it as a social ideal but there is much inquiry into the meaning of that ideal in terms of definite standards for concrete situations. The tendency has an evident relation to the preoccupation of present day educators in America with "behaviour" as against mere ideas.

Further, men and women, many of whom are responsible leaders of Christian churches and others of whom are not expressly identified with the churches, are coming together for serious inquiry into the meaning of Christianity for definite life situations. The recently organized group called the "Inquiry" is using the method of group discussion for the evaluation of standards of conduct. Its interest is not limited to industrial and economic questions but these are central in its researches and discussions. This undertaking is additional evidence that the Christian conscience in America is becoming sensitive not only on the question of stewardship but with reference to the sources and uses of wealth and power.

But the churches themselves are deeply interested in these questions, and have been since the pioneering days of Gladden, Strong and Peabody. It is a hopeful feature of American religious life that the most aggressive programs of social action affecting religion in industry have come from the churches themselves, that is from their stated teachers and organizations. This has been especially true of the northern Baptists, Congregationalists Disciples of Christ, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, northern Presbyterians, Protestant Episcopal, the Reformed Church in the United States, Unitarians and Universalists. The Methodist Federation for Social Service, organized in 1908, has devoted itself to the more radical phases of reconstruction, especially to its educational aspects, and has had great influence not only upon its own denomination but upon the other Protestant communions. The great mission boards of the American churches, both home and foreign give serious attention to industrial populations and industrial problems, as also the curricula of religious education. The northern Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, northern Methodists and Episcopalians have well staffed departments devoted exclusively to social work, with usually a major interest in labor and the problems of industry. The curricula of the theological seminaries of these churches and the educational work of their young peoples societies are fairly well socialized. The Congregationalists and Methodists collaborate in the production of Sunday school courses in this field, and the southern Methodists to a more limited extent. The northern Baptists have produced a notable literature centering in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, the Rochester Theological Seminary in which Walter Rauschenbusch was a teacher, and the Department of Social Service of the Publication Society of Philadelphia. The northern Presbyterian Board of National Missions may be said to have pioneered in the better relating of the churches to industrial populations and to the organized labor movement. It was through their initiative that representatives have been sent for years by the Federal Council of Churches of the Churches of Christ in America to the conventions of the American Federation of Labor, and that fraternal delegates from Ministers Associations in cities are sent to Central Trades and Labor Councils. The Toledo Council of Churches

also receives delegates from the Central Labor Union. Chicago Commons, connected for many years with the chair of Social Economics of the Chicago Theological Seminary, has had a powerful socializing influence in the middle west. It is perhaps unfair to refer to these particular seminaries without reference also to the attention which is being given to the same problems at Garrett, Yale, Boston, Cambridge, Union, and other seminaries.

The Federal Council of the Churches, through its Commission on The Church and Social Service, together with the social service departments of its constituent bodies, have for the last four years been carrying on numerous community and industrial conferences attended by ministers, employers, labor leaders, teachers and social workers, looking toward a better understanding and fuller cooperation between employers and employees, and toward the preparation of pastors to interpret Christian principles to those engaged in industry. These conferences have reached the organized life of communities, such as churches, colleges, chambers of commerce, labor temples, high schools, luncheon clubs and women's organizations. A significant feature has been the opening of pulpits on Sundays to progressive employers and representatives of labor.

The Young Men's Christian Association has also been holding many conferences in the same field, adhering mainly to the non-controversial aspect of industrial relationships, but also entering somewhat into the technical problems of industrial management in relation to labor.

The Young Women's Christian Association has accompanied its work with industrial women and girls by a program of education on industrial questions throughout its constituency and by participation in legislative activity. Its unique contribution has been its endeavor to make of its membership a fellowship of women of varied experiences in which the experience and point of view of the industrial group serve to interpret the meaning of industrial problems in human lives, and in which their needs have found expression through the policy of the organization as a whole.

The Federal Council of Churches has also organized a Department of Research and Education, an agency for the study of industrial and economic events and movements with a view to interpreting them to its constituency as they bear upon the progress of Christianity and the opportunity of the Church. It publishes a weekly Information Service of fact material in industry, race relations, rural economics and international affairs for use of pastors, editors, teachers and lay social workers. The Roman Catholic Church has made an important contribution during the last two years in the organization of the Catholic Industrial Conference. Jewish groups have likewise taken a new interest in industrial questions, and on several occasions, Protestants, Catholic and Jews have addressed themselves jointly to some outstanding industrial issue. It should be noted also that several of the large denominations in the United States are offering extensive opportunities

for the continuous training of their clergy, and readjusting their community contacts through Pastors' Summer Schools. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for example, had above 2000 pastors in such schools during the Summer of 1924.

No adequate account of the American Church's relation to industry could leave out the achievement of the Interchurch World Movement, which made an exhaustive study of the great steel strike in 1919 and published in its findings in a volume, and later a second volume, that attracted country-wide attention. It is recognized as an important contribution to the literature of labor relations as well as an evidence of the ability and readiness of a great official religious organization to enter a highly controversial field and bring out the essential facts with a degree of accuracy that is surprising in view of the newness of this field for religious effort. Lesser investigations have been made since that time, although in general it is felt that the research equipment of the churches should employ itself mainly in secondary study—that is, in authenticating and interpreting the findings of various specialized agencies of research and investigation.

The Industrial Order in the United States

We come now to a discussion of economic and industrial problems from the point of view of the Christian Church and with the American Church particularly in mind. The framers of this report acknowledge the impossibility of reporting in any authoritative way the judgment of the Christian community in this country. The consensus is still much less impressive than the dissensus. We are able only to record our own convictions, which we believe to be in accord with the trend of Christian opinion in the United States.

Even a cursory glance at modern industry discloses the fact that it is characterized by stress and strains, by discontent and strife. This condition and its causes have had classic statement from the labor point of view in the report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations. Having been created by Act of Congress, August 23rd, 1912, the report carries especial significance. We quote the following from the report:

"The sources from which this unrest springs are, when stated in full detail, almost numberless. But upon careful analysis of their real character they will be found to group themselves almost without exception under four main sources which include all the others. The four are:

- "1. Unjust distribution of wealth and income.
- "2. Unemployment and denial of an opportunity to earn a living.
- "3. Denial of justice in the creation, in the adjudication, and in the administration of law.
- "4. Denial of the right and opportunity to form effective organizations.

"The conviction that the wealth of the country and the income which is produced through the toil of the workers are distributed without regard to any standard of justice is as widespread as it is deep-seated. It is found among all classes of workers and takes every form from the dumb resentment of the day laborer, who, at the end of a week's back-racking toil finds that he has less than enough to feed his family, while others who have done nothing live in ease, to the elaborate philosophy of the "soap-box orator," who can quote statistics unendingly to demonstrate his contentions. At bottom, though, there is the one fundamental, controlling idea that income should be received for service and for service only, whereas, in fact, it bears no such relation, and he who serves least, or not at all, may receive most. . . .

"As a prime cause of a burning resentment and a rising feeling of unrest among the workers, unemployment and the denial of an opportunity to earn a living is on a parity with the unjust distribution of wealth. They may on final analysis prove to be simply the two sides of the same shield, but that is a matter which need not be discussed at this point. They differ in this, however, that while unjust distribution of wealth is a matter of degree, unemployment is an absolute actuality, from which there is no relief but soul-killing crime or soul-killing charity."

This description would not be accepted by many competent observers as an accurate portrayal of the present situation in industry in the United States, as not taking account of the favorable situation of labor in this country as compared with other lands, and as not duly appreciative of the progress which has taken place, which has been sketched in a previous section of this report. It must be recognized also that there prevails among American employers a general irritation at the demands of labor, a feeling that industry is shackled and made wasteful by union practices and regulations, a resentment against radical propaganda within the ranks of labor which engenders hatred and slackening of effort, and an attitude of unfriendliness to the labor movement as a whole growing out of an individualistic philosophy and the friction and losses arising from labor troubles.

It must be kept in mind also that there are thousands of industrial establishments, particularly the smaller ones, of which there are a vast number in America, in which these problems are not visibly present, and one might visit many shops, especially in unorganized industries and find comparative peace and an absence of hostile feeling. This is especially true where employers have had the vision to avoid suspicion and hostility by following the Golden Rule in their relations with their workmen. Furthermore, there has been a general increase in the prosperity of the wage workers since the war and the establishment of prohibition.

The studies of the National Industrial Conference Board find that

beginning with an index number of 100 in 1914, by June 1920 cost of living had reached a peak of 203 and hourly earnings 248. The index number of "real" hourly earnings was therefore 122. In June 1923 "real" earnings had reached an index number of 140. Research Report Number 62, p. 32.

Nevertheless the indictment by the United States Commission on Industrial Relations must be recognized as pertinent and to a disturbing extent justified by the facts.

The Purpose of Industry—The Profit Motive

It is against this background that we must consider the purpose of industry which we are asked particularly to discuss from the Christian point of view. It has been said in defense of the industrial regime that since the purpose of an industrial establishment is to produce goods, it is irrelevant to introduce any other criterion of judgment. On the other hand, it has been asserted by critics of industry that its true purpose is the more abundant life of the people. Again it is urged that the purpose of industry is to make profits for the owners. It seems apparent that no such thorough-going distinction can be maintained. Probably few exponents of these several opinions would defend them to their logical conclusions to the exclusion of other considerations.

Even if it were admitted that efficiency of production is one standard by which an industry should be judged, it must just as inevitably face a test growing out of its effect upon human life. The significance of the whole personnel movement in industry and business lies just here, that human relationships have come to be as definite a factor in success as in any technical element in the process. Industrial leaders seem to be alive to this fact and the crux of the situation in America is in the contest between labor unionism on the one hand and other forms of labor relations on the other, to determine which will survive in the effort to secure the willing cooperation of labor in the production of goods. The labor movement itself is impressive evidence of the large part played by human and personal factors in our economic life.

As for the contention that the purpose of industry is to make profits, we must distinguish between rewards in the sense of market value of labor or of money, and profit in the economic meaning of the term. There is a disposition today within the Christian community to question the ethical validity of pure profit in the economic sense, that is, a return from business enterprise or a business transaction that is quite beyond and separate from the "going rate" upon invested capital and the "wages of superintendence." In practice, speculative enterprises demand a return according to the risk involved without reference to the question whether the enterprise is socially legitimate or to the further question whether, granted that it is legitimate, the risk involved should not be socially insured. Although most would accept, probably few

critical minds would attempt to justify by a Christian standard the enormous profits which are frequently reaped from fortunate investment and which are often dependent upon values created by the community, when it is impossible to show any corresponding service which the community has received. It is increasingly questioned by many in church circles how the accumulation of profits in the economic sense—a gain in addition to the normal reward for service rendered—can constitute a tenable motive from the Christian point of view.

We feel strongly, however, that economic motives should be re-examined by Christian people from a New Testament point of view. When thus scrutinized it is difficult to see how there can be more than one answer to the issue raised. It is contained in the familiar concept of stewardship, which is given great attention in the United States by church boards in their efforts to increase giving to Christian causes. But unfortunately that word seems to have lost its major signification—namely, that for the Christian, private property, strictly speaking, does not exist, as it does not exist, absolutely, for any citizen. He does not own property: he holds it in trust for God. There is clearly no agreement among American Christians as to the consistency of the accumulation of large fortunes with the Christian view of wealth, but Christianity plainly requires that wealth shall be accumulated by a corresponding service; and that if one has come into the possession of wealth, it becomes at once a social trust. Going beyond this, many Christians are disturbed by the great gulf that has come to exist between the rich and the poor, not only because of the sufferings and privations of those at the bottom of the economic scale, but because of the spiritual isolation which the possession of wealth in the face of others' poverty brings to those at the top. In any case, it is from the Christian's point of view axiomatic that if the existence of large fortunes is held to be essential to the conservation of the social surplus, then it becomes the spiritual responsibility of those to whom this stewardship falls to use their wealth as a tool rather than to wear it as a garment, and to recognize that stewardship is not alone a responsibility to God, but also directly to society.

The Competitive System

The next problem to which the inquiry brings us is that of the moral quality of what we commonly call the competitive system. Probably this is too formal and abstract a term, for there are varieties of competition and they do not represent an organized system so much as an accumulation of human tendencies which stand out in sharp relief as they appear in relation to industry and trade. Here again there are widely variant views, within the Christian community, of the moral quality of common practices and attitudes.

We feel warranted in saying that competition on the lower economic level, which results in perpetual insecurity and a low standard of life—competition for work which forces wages to a level too low to sustain

a good life, or competition between business concerns whether national or international which jeopardizes sound and basic industries, is against public welfare. A Christian society should devise a better method of securing an adaptation of means to ends than one that inevitably makes the satisfaction of human needs a matter of hazardous enterprise.

The conditions which beset human life on the earth are such as to make struggle between individuals and groups and institutions as inevitable as their cooperation. The educational problem is therefore to win the thought of all to the common good, and to make cooperation the controlling spirit and method. There is a type of individualism from which mankind cannot escape no matter what collective enterprises it may embark upon. It calls for the attainment by individual men and women of spiritual excellence, a disciplined life, a consecrated will and a habit of sacrificial service. All social effort is ultimately dependent on the spiritual functioning of the personal life. It cannot be too strongly maintained that the Christian view of business and industry is not predicated upon an out and out substitution of altruistic for egoistic attitudes and motives, but upon a synthesis of these elements of life in what may be called a process of socialization. If cooperative methods come to prevail where now individual initiative is dominant it must be because of the demonstrated practical value of these methods for getting things done, and because of their better effect upon human life. It is here that the Christian view of industry and trade clashes with the prevailing economics. The business community as a whole still clings to the classical economics that treats labor as a commodity, although the idea that labor is not a commodity and must not be treated as such, now has the sanction of law and increasingly of public opinion, especially of church opinion, in the United States. The Christian indictment against this doctrine is not merely that it is morally wrong, but that it is scientifically unsound. Economics has been treated too much as a material science and not enough as a human science. Our newer school of economists, which goes by the designation, "Institutionalist," makes recognition of human factors in associated living and working which the older economics ignored. From this school organized religion is receiving invaluable aid in its attack upon evils in industry in whose defense a mechanistic theory has been advanced and stoutly maintained. The arbitrary rule of the law of supply and demand is gradually being humanized and corrected as men come to see that freedom and self expression and the impulse to mutual aid are as elemental in life as the quest of food and shelter.

Economic Alternatives

A discussion of the merits of our economic order brings us naturally to the consideration of what are commonly called possible alternatives to the present system. We feel that it is a mistake to think of the economic order in such definite and objective terms. It is not a unit thing to be accepted or rejected, to be voted in or out, but a complex of habits, at-

titudes and value-judgments which, barring social catastrophe, can be modified only by a gradual process of experiment, education and patient discipline. Least of all can we balance our present system against one abstraction after another which may be put forward as substitutes for it and decide with any degree of assurance what is the best solution of our social problems. Nothing is better established with reference to past efforts at reform and reconstruction than that the mere adoption of a program and the bestowal of authority upon its exponents inevitably occasions a recasting of the scheme itself in the interest of practicableness and in order to face the realities of life. It should go without saying, of course, that tentative goals and trial patterns must be made use of in the interest of definite and measurable progress but such goals and patterns must be regarded as means to a spiritual end which outlives all structural devices.

In place of a formal evaluation of conceivable alternatives to the industrial order as such, we offer a brief review of what seem to be the most fruitful lines of experimentation in this country and to suggest the most promising fields of further effort.

It is of first importance to note that progress is achieved not by superimposing some device upon industry or trade or education, but by dealing with specific conflicts over opposing interests or opposing ideas in such a way as to remove obstacles to cooperative activity and to bring about an integration of purpose in the light of better understood aims. Thus we progressively overcome friction in our social machinery and release new energies for creative work. This fact supplies us with a criterion for testing the many devices that are constantly appearing in business and industry for the purpose of promoting stability or of securing recognition of some group interest.

It is at this point that religious idealism tends to part company with the doctrinaire idealism of social radicals. The latter are so preoccupied with their role as custodians of an ultimate collective pattern for industrial life, that they make it a matter of loyalty to the pattern to treat as enemies all who do not share in their vision of it. It is this static element in their psychology that commits them to a catastrophic theory of social change, where other idealists look to change by social engineering.

Much difficulty has been experienced in the past by religious and other idealistic groups which have approached the industrial question from the viewpoint of ultimate right and wrong and have felt that any preoccupation with expedients savored of compromise and was a move in the direction of second-best rather than best ends in industrial reconstruction. We strongly feel that principles of action must be held in higher esteem than rules or mechanisms that are aimed at carrying out preconceived notions of what our industrial order should be. An examination of particular methods in concrete situations is the only adequate method of ascertaining what Christian ideals imply with respect to industry.

Collective Bargaining and Arbitration

The first fact that faces us in a survey of the instruments of industrial change is the institution of collective bargaining through trade unions. Unfortunately the significance of the trade union in this connection is often eclipsed by the industrial warfare which goes on intermittently between organized labor and its employers. This warfare is admittedly a matter of grave concern and careful students of American industrial conditions who are wholly sympathetic with the aspirations of labor have been led to point out the necessity of a more cooperative attitude on the part of labor and the assumption by the unions of a larger measure of responsibility. We quote from the report of the Conference on Ethical Forces in Advancing Standards in Industry of the National Conference of Social Work, submitted at Toronto in July, 1924: "Even the issue of collective bargaining cannot be settled objectively in accord with any slogan that either group in industry may invent. It is not a simple question of right and wrong: it is a way to industrial action along which the parties to industry must negotiate their passage in a spirit of give and take. Is it any wonder that we are marking time in the matter of securing recognition of the principle of collective bargaining when we try to prescribe it as a duty rather than as a highly experimental undertaking which indeed promises large rewards but only on condition that a high price is paid in terms of responsible, energetic action and good faith? Collective bargaining may mean much or little. To be sure, it is of more than ordinary use as an ideal principle of action for the reason that it is essentially dynamic rather than static. But to insist that an employer must recognize a union is of little use or meaning save as the question is asked, 'To what end'? The more progressive labor unions recognize this fact. They understand that in this connection, as in every other, self-determination has no moral quality save within the sphere of socially creative effort." The signers of this report include able representatives of the labor movement.

Latterly, there have been many evidences among labor organizations of a tendency to depend less upon force and to accept a larger measure of responsibility for the maintenance of efficiency and the safeguarding of production, and to have a greater regard for the interests of the community as a whole. The development of trade agreements through which such responsibilities are taken by organized labor is one of the most hopeful signs in American industrial life. Experiments are now under way, which will be watched with the greatest interest, looking toward joint industrial government in which the owners and workers in an establishment and the labor union to which the latter belong are partners in the enterprise.

Arbitration is an instrument very frequently employed to secure and maintain industrial peace. We think that the principle of arbitration should be very closely scrutinized. When it is simply the yielding of two parties to the will of the third party there is little that can be called

constructive in the process. We quote again from the Committee on Ethical Forces in Advancing Standards in Industry: "Arbitration has little in it to commend from the ethical point of view, unless it is a device self-imposed, merely as an instrument in the process of social adjustment within industry. When imposed by the community it may perhaps be justified as an emergency measure but it is essentially a negative and anti-social procedure because it puts an end to the only processes that can result in true solutions; it is terminal and static, not creative."

We are working out in America, however, an approach to what is sometimes referred to as constitutional government in industry through arbitration machinery jointly maintained and operated for the continuous government of industries under trade agreements. Illustrations are found in the impartial chairmanship maintained in the garment industry and in such national agreements as those in the newspaper business between publishers and printers, in the glass industry and the stove and heater industry. The superiority of this type of procedure rests not only upon the possibility of preventing stoppages but upon the recognition of the workers' status and the progressive establishment of a constitutional basis of industrial government.

It is pointed out by sympathetic observers of these new developments that their danger is in the possibility that they may degenerate into merely mechanical and legalistic devices, giving undue consideration to precedents and thus developing new forms of waste and failing to discover true equalities and to liberate new energies. It should be recognized also that the institution of the impartial chairmanship has even greater possibilities in the way of informal mediation and conciliation than in the more formal office of deciding issues that have resisted informal efforts at adjustment.

The Open Shop Movement

The legitimacy and value of trade unionism in the United States has been largely obscured of late by the Open Shop Movement. It is called by its promoters, The American Plan, and is in essence an effort to break or forestall the control of the union in shops and trade. It is directed first of all against the closed or entirely union shop. Theoretically, the open shop is consistent with dealing with regular union organizations, so long as they do not demand the closed shop; but in practice the Open Shop Movement is often an attack upon unionism, a most bitter and uncompromising attack. There is little value in belonging to a union if a worker is discharged when he attempts to organize, or if the employer refuses to meet his men collectively. As was remarked by one of our economists, "it would do him about as much good as to belong to a golf club."

However, the closed or strictly union shop—in which none but union men can work—in so far as it rests upon coercion is questionable in

Christian ethics and probably also is not necessary in union tactics. The Railway Brotherhoods have never demanded it, and great unions like the International Blacksmiths have succeeded without it. When a union shop is brought about by agreement without coercion, as is frequently done, it is a practical plan to which the religious spirit cannot lodge objection. The claim of the union to support by every worker who participates in the gains which union action has secured is valid. The use of coercive measures, however, to secure recognition of this principle is to be depreciated. There is need on all hands of reliance on Christian methods, even in times of industrial conflict.

Employee Representation

Employee representation is a device that was given considerable impetus by the War. It is sometimes carried on under a trade union agreement but commonly in America today it is regarded especially in labor circles as an alternative to trade union collective bargaining. It is perhaps not possible to render a fair judgment concerning this system because it has had but limited trial. In many cases employee representation schemes have been attempts to forestall trade union organization, but others are forward looking experiments in industrial democracy. Many of them are in industries which were not organized. No interest in labor morale can be permanently fruitful that does not spring from a deep respect for the workers themselves and a concern for their rights and interests. We believe, however, that no matter how imperfect a system of employee representation may be, any plan which provides for the judicial hearing of grievances and for the meeting of management and men as a matter of right and custom for the discussion of common problems is vastly superior to an autocratic form of industrial government. There is ground for the hope that autocracy is gradually giving way in this country, both as result of the pressure of the labor movement and in response to an active public opinion.

There has been a considerable development of profit sharing among large and important concerns. It has received interesting expression by a Western employer who holds that, for his best work, every employee must possess both craftsmanship and proprietorship, the latter taking the form not only of stock ownership but of the certainty of receiving his share of the prosperity of the enterprise. It is interesting to note that, significant as the principle of profit sharing is, it has seemed to affect the industrial situation in America but slightly. The theory that a worker is entitled not only to his wages but to a share in the profits without regard to the ownership of stock has plainly far reaching consequences. The operation of the plan in America, however, has been continually under the shadow of disapproval and suspicion on the part of labor because it not always worked out fortunately and has been considered an effort to purchase loyalty without the delegation of power. Regardless of the justification of this attitude, we

have here an evidence that money rewards do not by themselves meet the problem of industrial relations. Underlying all other interests of organized labor is the demand for self-determination.

*Appendix II. Government in the Clothing Industry of Chicago.

The Cooperative Movement

The cooperative movement has received much impetus in the last few years, particularly in agricultural communities. Its usefulness as a means of eliminating the middleman's profit where no corresponding service is rendered, is not to be questioned. In the fruit industry of the Pacific Coast for example its usefulness in standardizing quality and assuring stable markets, has been demonstrated. Studies are being made at the present time to determine what the cooperative movement has to offer in the way of raising the level of business and industrial relationships. Naturally up to this time the purely commercial aspects of cooperative processes have been dominant in these movements, but there are evidences also of the working of spiritual forces.

One of the major social tasks awaiting us in America is the solution of some of the problems of agricultural economics. We have already taken note of the forces that tend to array agriculture and industry against each other. The primal difficulty would seem to be a confusion over status. While in urban industry a line is sharply drawn between employer and owner on the one hand and worker on the other, the farmer, whether owner or tenant, scarcely knows whether his proper affinities are with labor or with capital. The farm owner is one of the hardest of workers and research economists say that the real income of the owner and tenant as a rule represents labor and not income from invested capital, yet he is frequently an employer of labor and a payer of wages. He is, therefore, in first hand contact with some of the elements of the labor problem. Yet, during recent years his difficulty in marketing his goods and the hardships which he suffers due to the high prices of manufactured products makes him anything but sympathetic with business and industry.

This situation results in a measure of bitterness among American farmers which is perhaps quite as sharp as that which is engendered in industrial conflict. By analogy to the industrial situation, it would seem that, just as the right of organization and the development of group consciousness on the part of employers on the one hand and workers on the other is a prerequisite of the highest form of group service, so in agriculture the farmers must find their place in the entire scheme of production and distribution and must develop a group consciousness comparable to that of the craft or professional guild before they can properly and usefully cooperate for the improvement of production and the enrichment of rural life. The most immediate need of the situation would seem to be a better understanding on the part of industrial employers and workers and of the urban community in general of the

conditions of the farmer's life and the problems of rural development and reconstruction.

Public Ownership in America

Public ownership in the United States is limited almost entirely to public utilities in cities, such as electric light, gas and water plants, a few street railways, subways and ferries, a very small railway mileage in the State of Virginia and in Alaska, and a temporary partnership in ship owning and operation growing out of the enormous merchantile marine which was created by the Government during the War. Municipal ownership of public utilities has had a checkered career, due to political control in most American cities, but with a noticeable and even rapid improvement in municipal administration, has come also increasing efficiency in the handling of such utilities. Few cities owning them will ever go back to private ownership.

The movement towards nationalization of the basic industries of coal and the railroads, for years a purely academic question in the United States, has received great reinforcement by the advocacy of the American Federation of Labor, and became for the first time a serious political issue in the last campaign. The Plumb Plan for the railroads and the plan proposed by the United Mine Workers for the mines, provide for public ownership but show a distrust of public operation. Each plan proposes control of these industries by a board of directors representing the government, the technicians, and the organized workers. Neither, however, has been adopted, but are still in the stage of discussion.

On the whole it must be recognized that operation of industries by the state, and all forms of state socialism, have had a distinct set back in public opinion, due partly to the experience of the War and partly to the development of Communism in Europe. The impression, due in part to propaganda, but also to the sincere objection based upon careful study of the facts, prevails, that state operation of public utilities, such as railroads in Europe, has not shown the initiative nor the economic advantages of private enterprise.

We would record our belief in the efficacy of certain auxiliary influences tending to improve industrial relations and pointing toward a more satisfactory industrial order. In this connection reference should be made to the Business Problems Group of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, composed largely of employers, which is seriously undertaking to study the problems of its own members with reference to specific proposals for improvement. Some of these employers have voluntarily submitted to a critical study of their plants in order to discover methods of further incorporating their Christian principles in the conduct of their enterprises. A similar undertaking was launched two years ago by the Business Men's Group of the Ethical Culture Society. A significant effort is also being developed in the state of Wisconsin under the leadership of the Congregational Church, but now

receiving the cooperation of other denominations, which is bringing together ministers, employers, workers and economists to study industrial conditions in the State and to promote good feeling and cooperation between employers and employees. Serious attention is also being given to the subject in the Sunday School curriculum for adult classes, and in mission study courses.

Civic, commercial and professional associations are also manifesting an interest in ethical problems of industry which is not without promise. Many Chambers of Commerce have broadened their social outlook although most of them are mighty "capitalistic". Some of them seek labor representation in their membership and are working for industrial good will, as for example in Seattle and Boise. Most Chambers now interest themselves in city planning, zoning, community chests and other social projects. Thousands of luncheon clubs, which are a striking feature of American business life to be found everywhere even in small communities, emphasize the service motive, offer opportunities for discussion of public questions and are generally interested in local social projects. There is a marked tendency at present to formulate business codes, notable among which are those undertaken under the auspices of the Federal Trade Commission and the United States Chamber of Commerce. A most significant event also took place recently in Washington under the leadership of the Department of Labor, when the paper box manufacturers of the country decided of themselves to eliminate Sunday work and to introduce the eight-hour day. These are illustrations of hopeful tendencies.

Workers' education, a comparatively new development, is recognized in America as an important force for progress. It is now in the critical position of determining whether it shall be a movement for technical and cultural education having its affinities with the entire community or a narrower movement representing only class interests. Both tendencies are apparent. The future must determine. The teacher may perhaps feel that he should meet his student where he is on the basis of his actually felt desire, trusting to the experience of study to liberalize the worker as the study course proceeds. There is undoubtedly here an extraordinary opportunity for leadership on the part of religious and social workers and of teachers of economics, sociology and political science, whose services are welcomed by these groups of working people who are seeking a larger life. The church group has shown a hopeful initiative in the projection of these schools in a few centers. Such participation, however, is not likely to rob the workers of initiative and leadership in a movement which they themselves have brought into being.

Closely related to this movement is that of labor research, which is one of the most important of the more recent developments in the industrial field. It is the basis not only of a new educational effort within the labor movement but the basis of an appeal to knowledge rather than to force.

The Opportunity of the Churches

Our final word has to do with the opportunity that faces the churches in the United States. The function of the church in relation to industry has been somewhat clarified by the discussion and experimentation which has followed the war. It must be said that the entrance of the church into the industrial field has occasioned much controversy. It has been received by most employers with either skepticism or unfriendliness, sometimes in like manner by labor and by a considerable element of the church itself. The question of competency has been most often raised, but also the more fundamental question of the right of the church to teach in this field.

On the other hand, the churches have had the encouragement of progressive employers who are working seriously at the problem of the Christian spirit in their industries. Their position was well stated five years ago by a well known employer before a conference of church leaders, employers, union officials and economists, who had been brought together by the Federal Council of the Churches to discuss the industrial policy of the Council. "The influence of religion," he said, "is absolutely essential to any constructive solution of the industrial problem, and the churches must undertake to teach regardless of the misunderstanding which arise. We employers will try to force you off the field, but you must not allow yourselves to be forced off. The human and ethical problems involved are within the comprehension of the average pastor if he will read and become familiar at first hand with local establishments."

The conference was of the opinion that the first task of the church would be to think through its own function and responsibility, and to assist pastors in their preparation to teach. This has been the serious task of the Federal Council and the departments of Social Service of its constituent denominations ever since, and the primary purpose of industrial conferences, Information Service, and books, pamphlets and reports which have been issued by the Federal Council.

The years which have followed have shown the soundness of the points of view expressed at this conference in 1920. It must be confessed also that they have brought a sobering realization of the lack of unity of the Church of Christ and the utter unreadiness of many pastors to do effective teaching. Nevertheless, the confidence of the churches in their ability to contribute seriously to the education of public opinion and to the setting up of authoritative Christian standards in industry itself, has grown with experience. The public also has been awakened to the influence of the churches, and none understand it better than those who look with misgivings or hostility upon their activities in the industrial field.

A noteworthy demonstration was made in 1923 in connection with the crusade against the twelve-hour day in the steel industry that moral opinion alone can work changes in the economic and industrial world.

The United States Steel Corporation declined to introduce the eight-hour day, at the request of President Harding, but the marshalling of public sentiment which was occasioned by the protests of religious bodies, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, brought about a change of policy within a few weeks.

The churches clearly have an opportunity for service in this field that has not yet been measured. Prophetic preaching, ethical teaching which is not confined to abstractions but is based upon concrete life situations and forms of service to industrial communities by local churches, will make the churches a potent influence in industrial reconstruction. The trend is steadily in this direction.

But the great service which the church can render, it becomes more and more apparent, will not be in the realm of economics, but in one more difficult and vital. It will be to give to American industry, as Mr. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of the Federal Department of Commerce, has said, "A lifting purpose greater than the struggle of materialism." It is to inspire business to take its place beside religion, education and medicine in the struggle for the more abundant life of humanity; and to contribute to both labor and capital the new leadership which is best described in the parable of the Good Shepherd. The church possesses the power, at least the latent power, to evangelize society with the spirit of cooperation and to set that spirit at work tomorrow in factory, agriculture, merchandizing and commerce. Society has reached a stage in which it becomes increasingly possible to substitute research and cooperation between groups and classes for the class struggle. We must recognize the fact of the class struggle, and that class organization is inevitable, but the conquest of one class by another, the inculcation of hatred, the reliance upon force, and the stimulation of the spirit of violence must give way to the spirit and method of the Kingdom of God.

APPENDIX I.

The Social Ideals of the Churches

Action Taken by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at a Special Meeting Held at Cleveland, Ohio, May 6-8, 1919.

RESOLVED: That we reaffirm the social platform adopted by the first Quadrennial in Chicago, 1912, and ratified by the Second Quadrennial in St. Louis, 1916.

That the churches stand for—

- I. Equal rights and justice for all men in all stations of life.
- II. Protection of the family by the single standard of purity, uniform divorce laws, proper regulation of marriage, proper housing.
- III. The fullest possible development of every child, especially by the provision of education and recreation.
- IV. Abolition of child labor.
- V. Such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.
- VI. Abatement and prevention of poverty.
- VII. Protection of the individual and society from the social, economic and moral waste of the liquor traffic.
- VIII. Conservation of health.
- IX. Protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational diseases and mortality.
- X. The right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, for safeguarding this right against encroachments of every kind, for the protection of workers from the hardships of enforced unemployment.
- XI. Suitable provision for the old age of the workers, and for those incapacitated by injury.
- XII. The right of employees and employers alike to organize; and for adequate means of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes.
- XIII. Release from employment one day in seven.
- XIV. Gradual and reasonable reduction of hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure, for all which is a condition of the highest human life.
- XV. A living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.
- XVI. A new emphasis upon the application of Christian principles to the acquisition and use of property, and for the most equitable division of the product of industry that can ultimately be devised.

—Adopted at Cleveland, O., in 1919.

APPENDIX II.

Industrial Government in the Clothing Industry in Chicago

Establishment of the present system of joint government in the men's clothing industry dates from the settlement of the Chicago strike of 1910. By the terms of that settlement, put into effect in 1911, the manufacturing firm of Hart, Schaffner and Marx, one of the largest in the industry, agreed to the formation of a joint board of arbitration with power to work out means for the settlement of any future grievances. On this foundation has grown the present structure.

During the eight years, from 1911 to 1919, the plan providing impartial machinery became more firmly established, more complete in detail. In 1919 plans of government similar to that worked out in Hart, Schaffner and Marx were adopted for the entire Chicago Market.

The establishment of order in the ranks of this one firm in Chicago followed a period of chaotic struggle in an industry presenting unique and grave problems. The clothing industry was highly seasonal, most of the employers were small contractors and competition among them was intense. The labor ranks were composed largely of immigrants striving to find a place in the new world, exploited by the competition and the tragic recurrence of unemployment.

Labor organization was attempted and for a time the United Garment Workers did manage to gain some power, but it was unable to bring order to the troubled state of the industry. Failure of the officers of the union to secure desired improvements in wages and working conditions and their termination of certain strikes without obtaining the relief sought and without the acquiescence of the rank and file, caused suspicion and dissatisfaction within the union ranks.

After the strike of 1910 a new path was followed in the shops of Hart, Schaffner and Marx. In order to work out a system of joint government, leadership was required on both sides. A labor manager was employed by the company, a man outside the industry, who could therefore come to the problems involved without prejudice. Prof. Earl Dean Howard of Northwestern University became the pioneer of this new type of labor manager.

Sidney Hillman, a young Russian Jew employed as a cutter in one of the Hart, Schaffner and Marx shops came into leadership among the workers during the 1910 labor troubles and later took a prominent part in the working out of the plan for joint government. With the labor group organized in the Hart, Schaffner and Marx shops as the nucleus, the workers in the men's clothing industry seceded from the United Garment Workers in 1914 and with Sidney Hillman as leader formed the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, organized on industrial rather than on craft lines. This union is independent, not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and is one of the most powerful in any industry.

The plan as put into operation in the shops of the Hart, Schaffner and Marx Company, has been amended and revised as the experience of the years has pointed the way. It provides for shop representatives, one elected by secret ballot by the union members of each shop for an indefinite term of office. All employees who are members of the union are entitled to vote and are also eligible for election. Four (or more if necessary) deputies are appointed by the union, representing each branch of the trade, (i. e. cutters, coat makers, trouser makers, vest makers) who devote all their time to assisting in the carrying out of the provisions of the agreement on behalf of the union. They devote all their time to union duties and are paid by the union. The company appoints such deputies as may be necessary in carrying out its side of the agreement.

A Trade Board, originally designed to include eleven members, five appointed by the union, five by the management and a neutral chairman appointed by the Board of Arbitration, was provided for, but for several years the activities of the Trade Board have been carried on by the Chairman alone. The Chairman holds office during the term of the agreement, and the agreements have since 1913 been renewed, revised and amended as desired every three years.

A rate Committee handles piece-rate making functions and is composed of three members, one selected by the employees, one by the management and the chairman of the Trade Board.

The Arbitration Board is composed of three members, one selected by the employees, one selected by the employers and a third by these two.

In the functioning of this plan the shop representatives have charge of complaints and organization matters within their shop. When a grievance arises in the shop it is reported to the shop representative who investigates it and takes it up with the shop superintendent and they try to reach a settlement. If no satisfactory solution can be reached the shop representative reports the matter to his deputy. Adjustments made in this way are not binding on their principals and are subject to revision by the Trade Board. The shop representatives may also collect union dues and perform any other such union duties provided they are carried out in such a way as not to interfere with shop discipline and efficiency. They are expected to promote amity and the cooperative spirit of the agreement.

If a complaint is referred to the deputies it is their duty to investigate and try to reach a satisfactory settlement. They have power to investigate, mediate and adjust complaints and have power to summon and examine witnesses, to present testimony or evidence and do any other similar tasks as may be necessary to place their case before the trial body. They have access to any shop for the purpose of making an investigation. The statement of the chief deputy is regarded as an authoritative presentation of the position of his principal and unless reversed or modified by either of the trial boards, the agreement of the chief deputies in all matters over which they have authority must be observed by all parties. If the deputies are unable to agree on an adjustment they certify the case to the Trade Board for trial. In making such certification the deputy appealing to the Board must file a statement giving specifically the nature of the complaint. A copy of this statement is furnished to the representative of the other party who is given at least 24 hours to prepare his answer unless an emergency demands an immediate trial. In the event of an appeal to the Trade Board or Arbitration Board the deputies may represent their respective principals before the Board.

The Trade Board is the primary board for adjusting grievances arising between the employees and the management. Complaints may be brought before it on appeal after action by the shop representatives and deputies or direct by either party without intervention of the shop representatives, or deputies. In the event of direct appeal a statement of the facts and grounds for such complaint must be filed in writing. All decisions of the Board must be rendered in writing and copies given to the representatives of each party. The Trade Board is authorized also to hear complaints from the union concerning the discipline of its members and to take any action necessary to conserve the interests of the agreement. In case either party should desire to appeal from any decision of the Trade Board, or from any change of rules by the Trade Board to the Arbitration Board they have the right to do so upon filing a notice in writing with the Trade Board within 30 days from the date of the decision. The Trade Board will then certify the matter to the Arbitration Board.

The Arbitration Board has full and final jurisdiction over all matters related to the agreement. It is the duty of the Board to investigate and mediate and adjudicate all matters brought before it. The practice developed leaves all questions of fact and testimony mainly to the consideration of the Trade Board, while the Board of Arbitration concerns itself mainly with questions of principle and the application of the agreement to new issues as they arise. This is not considered as limiting the powers of the Arbitration Board which are broad enough to make it the judge of facts as well as principle when necessary. A majority decision of the Board is binding on all parties.

During the latter part of 1918 and the early months of 1919 the union carried on an intensive organization campaign and by May had most of the clothing workers in the Chicago market enrolled, and it was possible then to insist upon agreements similar to the one in force in the Hart, Schaffner and Marx shops. Large independent manufacturers and the Wholesale Clothiers' Association and the Wholesale Tailors' Association had signed such agreements by the end of May of that year and the entire Chicago market began operating on a system of joint government. The plan varying in details but similar in intent and function has been adopted in other markets and a National Federation of Clothing Manufacturers has been organized to deal with the national organization of the workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ECONOMIC, INDUSTRIAL AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Clothing Workers of Chicago, 1910-1922.

Chicago Joint Board, 1922

A comprehensive account of the history, organization and operation of one of the most advanced experiments in the joint control of an industry by employers and their organized employes.

American Academy of Political and Social Science. (Comp.)

Ethics of the Professions and of Business.

Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, May, 1922, Vol. CI, No. 190.

A special issue of the Annals devoted to a selected collection of accounts of the attempts made by various business and professional groups to frame ethical standards looking toward social control. Of value in having gathered together the expressions of efforts in this transitional phase of development.

Beard, Mary.

A Short History of the American Labor Movement.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1920, and The Worker's Book Shelf.

A brief and elementary substitute for the longer and more scholarly work of Commons and Associates.

Berridge, William Arthur.

Cycles of Unemployment in the United States, 1903-1922.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923.

A study, which in its original form won first prize from the Pollak Foundation for Economic Research, revised for publication as one of its series. The meagerness and unsatisfactory character of unemployment statistics, especially prior to 1914, made it necessary for the author to attempt to obtain a register of relative intensity only, the movements of unemployment above and below a norm, without reference to the actual numbers unemployed. It has laid a basis for further investigation and is a contribution to the study of the problem.

Bing, Alexander M.

Wartime Strikes and Their Adjustment.

New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921

A valuable account of the labor difficulties which occurred during the war, of the agencies created for their adjustment and of the principles which guided the endeavor to meet the emergency situation.

Blankenhorn, Heber N.

The Strike for Union.

New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1924.

A study of the problems involved in a strike for unionization in the coal fields, based on the history of the Somerset, Pennsylvania, strike of 1922-1923.

Boeckel, Richard.

Labor's Money.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1923.

The first attempt to set forth in detail labor's experiments in the conduct of banks. The book is of value in bringing to public attention the first three years' accomplishments in this new field.

Bogart, Ernest Ludlow.

Economic History of the United States.

New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1922.

A good background for understanding the present economic situation in this country.

Budish, Jacob M. and Soule, George Henry.

The New Unionism in the Clothing Industry.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1920.

A presentation of the progressive development of the unions in the various branches of the clothing industry toward the "new unionism," of the elements involved, the steps taken and the new emphases which mark the new trend.

Carroll, Mollie Ray.

Labor and Politics: the Attitude of the American Federation of Labor towards Legislation and Politics.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923.

A careful study of one phase of the relation between labor and politics in the United States. Presents the relation of a specific industrial organization to politics and law and gives a comprehensive statement of the Federation's policy and a valuable discussion of the limitations of its program as judged by its own standards.

Case, Clarence Marsh.

Non-violent Coercion.

New York: Century Co., 1923.

A study of peaceful social pressure, discussing the two phases—the resistance of a group, like the conscientious objectors, to the attempts of society to force them into activities against their will, and of groups like the followers of Gandhi who attempt to work specific changes by non-violent coercion.

Chenery, William L.

Industry and Human Welfare.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.

A brief history of the development of American industry in relation to the welfare of the workers.

Commons, John Rogers, and others.

Industrial Government.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1923.

A popular presentation of the observations of a group which, under the direction of Professor Commons and financed by four Wisconsin employers, set out to examine some of the establishments which are experimenting with plans for employee representation.

Commons, John Rogers, and others.

History of Labor in the United States.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1918.

Generally accepted as a standard history of American trade-unionism and other aspects of the labor movement in this country up to the war period.

Commons, John Rogers and Andrews, John Bertram.

Principles of Labor Legislation (Revised edition).

New York: Harper Bros., 1920.

The best single work on the relation of the law to labor and the problem of welfare and protective legislation in the United States.

Mitchell, Wesley Clair, and others.

Income in the United States: its Amount and Distribution, 1909-1919.
New York; National Bureau of Economic Research, 1921-22.

An illuminating study of our national income. The text and its detailed tables give the best presentation of the amount and distribution of our national income which has yet been made. The subject is one difficult to treat in a satisfactory manner, because wholly adequate, comparable data are lacking.

Myers, James.

Representative Government in Industry.

New York: George H. Doran Co., 1924.

A presentation of experiments with shop committees and employe representation plans. The author is associated with one of the most interesting of such experiments.

National Bureau of Economic Research.

Business Cycles and Unemployment.

New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1923.

A compendium of the points of view of numerous experts on various aspects of the prosperity-depression fluctuations. It is the most comprehensive compilation of discussions of this perplexing problem.

National Industrial Conference Board.

The Growth of Works Councils in the United States.

Special Report Number 32, New York, 1925.

Patten, Simon Nelson.

Essays in Economic Theory.

New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924.

A valuable collection of suggestive essays on economic theory including the author's two important monographs, **The Theory of Dynamic Economics** and **The Reconstruction of Economic Theory**.

Plumb, Glenn Edward and Roylance, W. G.

Industrial Democracy: A Plan for its Achievement.

New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1923.

A discussion of the extension of the "Plumb Plan," as originally proposed for the railroads, to all industry.

Pound, Arthur.

The Iron Man in Industry.

Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1922.

A discussion of the effect of machine production on human beings. The whole is the presentation of the point of view of an observer rather than a scientific treatise.

Savage, Marion Dutton.

Industrial Unionism in America.

New York: Ronald Press, 1922.

A study of the three important phases of industrial unionism in America: (1) the tendencies toward industrial unionism of certain of the unions within the A. F. of L.; (2) revolutionary industrial unionism including workers of all industries; (3) independent industrial unionism in an individual industry.

Bogart, Ernest Ludlow.

Economic History of the United States.

New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1922.

A good background for understanding the present economic situation in this country.

Budish, Jacob M. and Soule, George Henry.

The New Unionism in the Clothing Industry.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1920.

A presentation of the progressive development of the unions in the various branches of the clothing industry toward the "new unionism," of the elements involved, the steps taken and the new emphases which mark the new trend.

Carroll, Mollie Ray.

Labor and Politics: the Attitude of the American Federation of Labor towards Legislation and Politics.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923.

A careful study of one phase of the relation between labor and politics in the United States. Presents the relation of a specific industrial organization to politics and law and gives a comprehensive statement of the Federation's policy and a valuable discussion of the limitations of its program as judged by its own standards.

Case, Clarence Marsh.

Non-violent Coercion.

New York: Century Co., 1923.

A study of peaceful social pressure, discussing the two phases—the resistance of a group, like the conscientious objectors, to the attempts of society to force them into activities against their will, and of groups like the followers of Gandhi who attempt to work specific changes by non-violent coercion.

Chenery, William L.

Industry and Human Welfare.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.

A brief history of the development of American industry in relation to the welfare of the workers.

Commons, John Rogers, and others.

Industrial Government.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1923.

A popular presentation of the observations of a group which, under the direction of Professor Commons and financed by four Wisconsin employers, set out to examine some of the establishments which are experimenting with plans for employee representation.

Commons, John Rogers, and others.

History of Labor in the United States.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1918.

Generally accepted as a standard history of American trade-unionism and other aspects of the labor movement in this country up to the war period.

Commons, John Rogers and Andrews, John Bertram.

Principles of Labor Legislation (Revised edition).

New York: Harper Bros., 1920.

The best single work on the relation of the law to labor and the problem of welfare and protective legislation in the United States.

Commons, John Rogers (ed.)

Trade Unionism and Labor Problems (second series)

New York: Ginn & Co., 1921.

One of the best standard works on this general subject in the United States.
An excellent text book.

Cowdrick, Edward S.

Manpower in Industry.

New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1924.

A presentation of the principles of human relationship in industry and of some of the problems of personal administration.

Douglas, Paul Howard, and others.

The Worker in Modern Economic Society.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

One of the best single volumes covering the whole range of labor and industry. A book of readings, well arranged, under the main headings—Human Nature and Industry, The Development of Economic Organization, The Worker in His Relation to the Market, Security and Risk, The Worker's Approach to His Problems, The Employers' Approach, the Communities' Approach.

Edie, Lionel Danforth (ed.)

Stabilization of Business.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1923.

A carefully selected series of articles by various authorities on different phases of the control of business cycles. It is suggestive and non-technical in presentation.

Federated American Engineering Societies.

Waste in Industry.

New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1921.

A detailed engineering study of the waste in typical industries and the responsibilities for it. An enlightening book on an important phase of industry.

Fitch, John A.

The Causes of Industrial Unrest.

New York: Harper & Bros., 1924.

An examination, with the most recent statistics, of the situations that give rise to industrial unrest—wages, hours, unemployment, status of unions with employers and under the law, etc.

French, Carroll Eiker.

The Shop Committee in the United States.

Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1923.

A doctor's thesis on the shop committee. It is a careful objective piece of work based largely on documentary sources and is of value in having gathered such sources together.

Friday, David.

Profits, Wages and Prices.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1920.

A presentation of the course of profits, wages and prices, with a concluding chapter on the possibilities of increasing real wages.

Goldmark, Josephine C.

Fatigue and Efficiency.

New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912.

The standard work on the relation between the fatigue of the worker and the quality and quantity of his output. It must be included because no recent book covers the field as does this work.

Hamilton, Walton Hale and May, Stacy.

The Control of Wages.

New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923, and The Worker's Book Shelf.

A study of the sources from which wage increases may come, and action that might bring higher wages.

Hoxie, Robert Franklin.

Scientific Management and Labor.

New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1915.

The point of view of an economist, sympathetic with both trade unions and scientific management, on the conflict between them. The book is older than most of the volumes here listed but is valuable because of its point of view.

Johnsen, Julia E.

Selected Articles on Government Ownership of Coal Mines.

New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1923.

Readings on the coal problem arranged as for a debate on government ownership.

King, Wilford Isbell.

Employment, Hours and Earnings in Prosperity and Depression, United States, 1920-22.

New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1923.

A valuable and comprehensive study of the effect of the economic cycle on employment and earnings. Covers by careful estimate fields for which data are not collected. Throws new light on several phases of this important problem.

Kirkconnell, Watson.

International Aspects of Unemployment.

New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1923.

A presentation of the unemployment problem in its broadest phases, emphasizing that unemployment cannot be successfully coped with on a local or national basis, and showing the ramifications that make it a world problem.

Klein, Philip.

The Burden of Unemployment.

New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1923.

A study of the unemployment relief measures adopted in 15 American cities during the depression period of 1921-22. The second part of the volume deals with the use of employment statistics.

Leiserson, William M.

Adjusting Immigrant and Industry.

New York: Harper Bros., 1924.

A practical study of the relationship between the immigrant and our industrial regime. The book is not doctrinaire, but treats the subject objectively. The author, well equipped for the task, is chairman of the Arbitration Board in the New York and Rochester market of the clothing trade, an industry employing a high percent of foreign born workers.

Mitchell, Wesley Clair, and others.

Income in the United States: its Amount and Distribution, 1909-1919.

New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1921-22.

An illuminating study of our national income. The text and its detailed tables give the best presentation of the amount and distribution of our national income which has yet been made. The subject is one difficult to treat in a satisfactory manner, because wholly adequate, comparable data are lacking.

Myers, James.

Representative Government in Industry.

New York: George H. Doran Co., 1924.

A presentation of experiments with shop committees and employee representation plans. The author is associated with one of the most interesting of such experiments.

National Bureau of Economic Research.

Business Cycles and Unemployment.

New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1923.

A compendium of the points of view of numerous experts on various aspects of the prosperity-depression fluctuations. It is the most comprehensive compilation of discussions of this perplexing problem.

National Industrial Conference Board.

The Growth of Works Councils in the United States.

Special Report Number 32, New York, 1925.

Patten, Simon Nelson.

Essays in Economic Theory.

New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924.

A valuable collection of suggestive essays on economic theory including the author's two important monographs, **The Theory of Dynamic Economics** and **The Reconstruction of Economic Theory**.

Plumb, Glenn Edward and Roylance, W. G.

Industrial Democracy: A Plan for its Achievement.

New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1923.

A discussion of the extension of the "Plumb Plan," as originally proposed for the railroads, to all industry.

Pound, Arthur.

The Iron Man in Industry.

Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1922.

A discussion of the effect of machine production on human beings. The whole is the presentation of the point of view of an observer rather than a scientific treatise.

Savage, Marion Dutton.

Industrial Unionism in America.

New York: Ronald Press, 1922.

A study of the three important phases of industrial unionism in America: (1) the tendencies toward industrial unionism of certain of the unions within the A. F. of L.; (2) revolutionary industrial unionism including workers of all industries; (3) independent industrial unionism in an individual industry.

Seasonal Operation in the Construction Industries.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1924.

The report, with recommendations, of a committee of the president's Conference on Unemployment presenting methods for the solution of seasonal problems through specified cooperation of trades and professions vitally concerned in each locality—architects, engineers, bankers, contractors, building-material dealers and producers, real estate men and building trades labor.

Suffern, A. E.

Conciliation and Arbitration in the Coal Industry of America.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1915.

Though not a current book it is perhaps the best source of information for an understanding of the background of the long struggle for organization in the coal industry.

Tugwell, Rexford, Guy (ed)

The Trend of Economics.

New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924.

Papers by a dozen of the leading younger American economists, of the present trend in economic theory and practice. Some of them are a little technical, but the book is highly suggestive of the possible contributions of genuine economic science to social amelioration.

Veblen, Thorstein.

Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times.

New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1923.

Traces the origin and evolution of our present-day group life and activities as centered in and influenced by the practice of absentee ownership of industrial equipment and its credit economy, and the effect of this absentee control over the lives and affairs of the classes of people making up the group. He then endeavors to probe future trends.

Veblen, Thorstein.

The Engineers and the Price System.

New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1921.

An exposition of the opposition between productive efficiency and the modern commercial system. Its chief lack is quantitative evidence.

Warbasse, James Peter.

Cooperative Democracy.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1923.

A presentation of the Rochdale principle of consumers' cooperation made by an author writing as a pleader for this form of organization. Of value in so far as it states the Rochdale principle for those not familiar with its tenets.

Zimand, Savel.

Modern Social Movements.

New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1921.

A descriptive hand book of the various social and economic movements in the modern world, with extensive bibliography.

IN PREPARATION

National Bureau of Economic Research.

Growth of American Trade Unions from 1880 to 1920.

Will give comparative trade union membership statistics year by year; and will show which industries are most highly organized, which least; which unions are increasing in membership, which are decreasing; proportion of total gain fully employed belonging to trade unions; number of women enrolled in trade unions; whether women's unions are increasing or decreasing; in which industries women's unions are most active; and the extent of organization among "professional workers."

II. CHURCH AND INDUSTRY

Coffin, Henry Sloane.

A More Christian Industrial Order.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1920.

A popular discussion of Christian principles in industry, by a prominent preacher.

Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook.

The Church and Industrial Reconstruction.

New York: Association Press, 1920.

The best summary that has been made of the Christian ideal for society, the un-Christian aspects of the present industrial order and giving a critical view of the Christian attitude toward the present system, its failures and their ramifications, and throwing light upon some of the steps that may be taken toward a more Christian order.

Douglass, H. Paul.

From Survey to Service.

New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, 1921.

A mission study volume on the work of the church for industrial groups.

Eddy, Sherwood.

The New World of Labor.

New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923.

A bird's-eye-view of trends in the realm of labor subsequent to the war, as noted by the author while making a trip around the world in 1922-1923. The work is not exhaustive, could not be, under the circumstances, but in a popular presentation it gives the reader a glimpse of some significant trends in the various countries visited.

Ellwood, Charles A.

The Reconstruction of Religion.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.

A discussion of the church and social problems from the viewpoint of social science.

Husslein, Joseph.

Work, Wealth and Wages.

Chicago: Matre & Co., 1921.

A discussion of the application of Christian principles to modern social and industrial questions, from the Catholic point of view

Interchurch World Movement.

Report on the Steel Strike of 1919.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1920.

A volume unique in its plan to present all the phases and contributory factors of a single strike as assembled and studied by persons not participating in the conflict. It is the only volume devoted to a study of one strike in the United States.

Public Opinion and the Steel Strike.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1921.

Supplementary reports of some of the investigators who did the field work for the original report on the steel strike. Each of the supplementary reports in this volume treats of one special problem, including: under-cover men, the Pittsburg newspapers and the strike, civil rights in Western Pennsylvania, the mind of immigrant communities, welfare work of the U. S. Steel Corporation, the Pittsburg pulpit and the strike, the steel report and public opinion.

Johnson, F. Ernest and Holt, Arthur E.

Christian Ideals in Industry.

New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1924.

A book prepared primarily for young people's and adult classes in church schools. It seeks to lead the reader in questioning what the principles of a Christian industrial order actually mean in terms of the daily conduct of industry. This is its aim rather than either the statement of the principles themselves or the laying down of rules for the solution of specific industrial problems.

Johnson, F. Ernest and Ryan, John A. (eds.)

Industrial Relations and the Churches.

The Annals. American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, September 1922.

This issue of the Annals is devoted to discussions of industrial relations and the churches. The problems of industrial conflict are stated and discussed by men in first-hand touch with some phase of the problem. In like manner the social functions of industry are presented and discussed. Then the church's duty in relation to industry is discussed by religious leaders of the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths, and by employers, employees, ministers and laymen. The final section is devoted to statements on the industrial programs of various religious bodies. The discussion is of value in assembling a wide range of opinion on this subject.

Page, Kirby (ed.)

Christianity and Economic Problems.

New York: Association Press, 1922.

This is the second volume of the Social Problem Discussion Series. It contains a running text drawn from various sources giving information on the point under discussion. At the end of each chapter questions for thought and discussion are listed.

Ranschenbusch, Walter.

Christianity and the Social Crisis.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1911.

One of the most important of the pre-war discussions of the church and social problems, by an outstanding exponent of social Christianity. The first section of the book sketches the historical aspects of the question, while the body of the volume discusses the challenge of modern conditions.

Ryan, John A. and Husslein, Joseph (eds.)

The Church and Labor.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1920.

An important collection of Catholic documents on labor questions.

Ryan, John A.

Social Reconstruction.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1920.

A volume of lectures discussing the Roman Catholic Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction by the Director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Ward, Harry F.

The New Social Order.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.

Against the background of the conviction "that a new order of social living is necessary for both the practical and the spiritual interests of humanity," the author discusses the nature and principles of this new order and the programs for a new order which have emerged from various quarters including the pronouncements on social ethics emanating from many religious bodies. It is valuable to have these programs gathered together for purposes of comparison, evaluation and the light they throw upon trends of thought.

Ward, Harry F.

The Profit Motive.

New York: League for Industrial Democracy, 1924.

An analysis of the profit motive showing its weaknesses, and discussing other more valid motives.

III. ENGLISH BOOKS *

Askwith, Sir G. R.

Industrial Problems and Disputes.

London: Murray, 1920.

A large book reviewing the experiences of one of the most prominent British labor mediators and arbitrators. Full of wisdom and stimulation.

Clay, Henry.

Economics, an Introduction for the General Reader.

New York: Macmillan Co., 1920.

One of the best and most readable treatments of general economics from the point of view of a liberal, though not a radical, economist. A good basis for those who have not had recent training in economic theory.

Cole, G. D. H.

Workshop Organization.

London & New York: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Presents valuable documents illustrating the constitution and functions of works committees and shop stewards and suggestive material relating to the practice of democratic methods of industrial administration. Its chief value lies, as the author says, in the material it affords for a study "of the response of the working class to changes in its economic environment."

Hobson, John A.

The Evolution of Modern Capitalism (new edition)

New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1913.

Though older than the other books considered for this list it must be included as the standard work on this subject. It is a study by the noted economist of the growth of modern capitalistic institutions and of its meaning.

Robertson, Dennis Holme.

The Control of Industry.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1923.

A brief, clear discussion of the necessity and possibility of the control of industry for social purposes.

Russell, Bertrand.

Proposed Roads to Freedom.

New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1919.

Description and evaluation of the various programs for economic and social change.

Tawney, Richard Henry.

The Acquisitive Society.

New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1920.

A brilliant plea from ethical and economic standpoints, for a society based upon service rather than profit. One of the most challenging and discerning indictments of capitalism.

Webb, Sidney and Webb, Beatrice.

Industrial Democracy (revised edition)

New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920.

The standard study of the operation of trade unionism in England, and of its problems.

Webb, Sidney and Webb, Beatrice.

History of Trade Unionism (revised edition)

New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920.

The standard history of British trade-unionism.

Webb, Sidney and Webb, Beatrice.

A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain.

New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920.

A carefully presented outline of a possible future society resting on public ownership, cooperation, and industrial democracy in private enterprise.

Webb, Sidney and Webb, Beatrice.

The Consumers' Cooperative Movement.

London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1921.

The best single study, sympathetic but critical, of consumers' cooperation in Great Britain.

Webb, Sidney and Webb, Beatrice.

Decay of Capitalist Civilization.

London: Allen & Unwin, 1923.

An indictment of capitalism in all its forms and phases, presented from two standpoints—moral and economic.

* These English books are listed here because they have become a recognized part of American economic thought.

Printed in U. S. A.
THE GOTHIC PRESS
New York, N. Y.

THE CHURCH AND
SOCIAL AND MORAL
PROBLEMS



American Section
Report of Commission III
to
THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK
HELD IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN
August 19-30, 1925

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK

Commission Reports

- I. The Church's Obligation in View of God's Purpose for the World.
- II. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
- III. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
- IV. The Church and International Relations.
- V. The Church and Education.
- VI. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts By the Christian Communions.

GENERAL PREFACE

A few words should be written about the inception of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In the summer of 1919 the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches met at The Hague. This was the first meeting of an international character held after the signing of the Armistice, if one excepts a small gathering of labor leaders. About sixty leaders of the Churches were present, representing nearly all the Protestant Communions and most of the countries of Europe. Ten or twelve delegates were present from America.

The meetings at The Hague developed so sweet and reasonable an atmosphere, at a time when great bitterness prevailed everywhere, and the delegates present expressed themselves so strongly as to the un-Christian character of war and the necessity of establishing a world order on a new and Christian basis, that several of the delegates felt strongly that the time had come for the Churches officially to get together and say what these Churchmen semi-officially were saying. As a result Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of America, the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and others held an informal meeting to discuss the possibility of bringing the Churches of the world together for a Conference, where the Churches could utter their united conviction on international matters and all other matters with which society would have to deal in the reconstruction of civilization and the building of a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old, which lay all about them.

This preliminary meeting was not altogether spontaneous for on two separate occasions during the progress of the war, Archbishop Soederblom had communicated with the Churches of Europe and America regarding the possibility of such a conference and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America had suggested that a Conference of the Federated bodies of Churches in all the countries might meet together after the war. The unanimous opinion of the unofficial group at The Hague was that a committee should be appointed to bring the leaders of the Churches together with the aim of convincing them of the necessity of such a world gathering of the Churches, and asking them to take the matter up with their respective denominations. This committee went from The Hague to Paris and brought together as many of the leaders of the Churches as possible upon such short notice. This meeting became greatly interested in the project and requested Dr. Frederick Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenical Conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America to arrange for a preliminary meeting of the Churches the following summer.

Dr. Lynch proceeded from Paris to London and had several interviews with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F. B. Myers, Dr. Thomas Nightingale, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare and others. Meantime, Archbishop Soederblom undertook to interest the Scandinavian Churches and Dr. Choisy

the Swiss Churches. Sufficient interest was aroused to warrant the calling of a preliminary Conference at Geneva in the summer of 1920.

As a result of the procedures recorded above, one hundred delegates assembled at Geneva in August of 1920. A three days session was held and the Conference gradually began to assume shape. Great interest was manifested and all present expressed themselves to the effect that the Church Universal had a great opportunity to exert a determining influence upon the new order that must follow the war. Furthermore the world was waiting for some great pronouncement from the Church upon such questions as war and peace, the industrial order; such immediate problems as those having to do with intemperance and vice and upon all ethical and moral questions. It was felt that a positive and commanding utterance of the Churches in these trying years would do much to encourage a disheartened world and would make it much easier for those who were trying to reconstruct the world on a Christian basis to carry on this high task. There was much confusion in the world as to just where the Church did stand on these great problems disturbing the minds of men. The conviction was expressed that only as the rule of life laid down by the gospels became the law of nations could any hope for security and peace be found or the great sores of the world be healed.

Furthermore it was felt by all that whatever new international machinery might be set up or whatever new industrial order might arise it was only as these were permeated by the spirit of Jesus Christ that they would fulfill the high hopes of their founders. It was also strongly felt that two great blessings might ensue from such a Conference. On the one hand all individual communions would profit by this period of common intercourse, especially those communions that had greatly suffered from the war. They would be made strong in the consciousness of the oneness of all Christ's disciples. On the other hand the coming together, if only for a month, of all the Churches of the world to cooperate in the common task of redeeming the world order, and to make some great common pronouncement on the place of Christ in civilization would be a great object lesson to the world.

At Geneva a large International Committee was set up which was divided into four groups, one for America, one for the British Empire, one for the European Protestant churches and the fourth representing the Orthodox Eastern Church. The International Committee appointed a smaller Executive Committee, which held three meetings in successive years, one at Peterborough, England, one at Zurich, Switzerland and one at Amsterdam, Holland. In August, 1922, the International Committee itself met at Helsingborg, Sweden, and was very fully attended by delegates from all the communions and nations. At this meeting the programme for the Conference assumed final shape. It was voted that the program for Stockholm should include the following groups of subjects:

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's purpose for the world.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The reports which followed are in fulfillment of this vote taken at Helsingborg. In April, 1924, the full Committee met again at Birmingham, England, in connection with C. O. P. E. C. and reviewed the progress made upon the reports and dealt specifically with plans for the Stockholm meeting.

This is in brief the history of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and is the explanation of the reports which follow. These reports have been prepared with great care by the leaders of the Churches and by experts in the several questions discussed. They are submitted to the Conference in the hope that the Conference will receive them in the same spirit in which they have been written, i.e. in the endeavor to find the common consciousness of the Churches upon these subjects and to voice its united feeling.

LIST OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Joint-Chairmen

REV. F. W. BURNHAM, LL.D.
President, United Christian Missionary Society.

BISHOP JAMES CANNON, Jr., D.D.
Chairman, Executive Committee, World League Against Alcoholism. Chairman,
National Legislative Committee, Anti-Saloon League.

Secretaries

REV. ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY, D.D., LL.D.
Formerly Executive Secretary, Home Missions Council. Member, Board of Man-
agers, American Baptist Home Missions Society.

REV. CHARLES E. SCHAEFFER, D.D.
General Secretary, Board of Home Missions of Reformed Church in U. S.

Members

ALLEN, MRS. J. S.
Corresponding Secretary, Women's Board of Domestic Missions, Reformed Church
in America.

BARNES, REV. LEMUEL CALL, D.D.
Secretary, American Baptist Home Missionary Society.

BENNETT, MRS. FREDERICK S.
President, Woman's Board of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.

BURTON, REV. CHARLES E., D.D.
Secretary, National Council of Congregational Churches.

DAVIS, REV. CARROLL, M., D.D.
Domestic Secretary, Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, Protestant Epis-
copal Church.

EMPRINGHAM, REV. JAMES, D.D.
National Superintendent, Law Observance League.

FORSYTH, REV. D., D.D.
Corresponding Secretary, Board of Home Missions and Church Extension of
Methodist Episcopal Church.

FOUT, BISHOP HENRY H.
Bishop of United Brethren Church.

FRANKLIN, REV. JAMES H., D.D.
Foreign Secretary, American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society.

HAVEN, REV. WILLIAM I., D.D., LL.D.
General Secretary, American Bible Society.

HAYNES, PROF. GEORGE E., Ph.D.
Former Director, Negro Economics, U. S. Department of Labor. Secretary, Com-
mission on Church and Race Relations, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ
in America.

HOLTZMAN, MRS. C. L.
President, Woman's Department, The Chicago Church Federation.

- HUTCHISON, REV. R. A.
Secretary, Home Missions Board, United Presbyterian Church.
- KITTELL, REV. JAMES S., D.D.
President, Board of Domestic Missions, Reformed Church in America.
- KNUBEL, REV. FREDERICK H., D.D., LL.D.
President, United Lutheran Church in America.
- LAWSON, REV. ALBERT G., D.D.
President, Baptist Education Society, State of New York.
- LINDLEY, MISS GRACE
Active Secretary, Woman's Auxiliary to Board of Home Missions, Protestant Episcopal Church.
- McCOY, MRS. J. H.
- MILLER, REV. RUFUS W., D.D.
Secretary and Editor, Publication and Sunday School Board of Reformed Churches in U. S.
- MILLIKEN, HON. CARL ELIAS, LL.D.
Ex-Governor of Maine. Chairman, Commission on Temperance, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- MOORE, BISHOP JOHN M., D.D., Ph.D.
Brazil Episcopal District, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- MORRIS, REV. S. LESLIE
Secretary, Executive Committee of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church in U. S.
- POLING, REV. DANIEL A., LL.D., Litt.D.
President, National Temperance Council of America.
- RUSSELL, REV. HOWARD HYDE, D.D.
One of the Founders and first General Superintendent Anti-Saloon League of America. One of the Founders and first American President, World League Against Alcoholism.
- SCOTT, EMMETT J., LL.D.
Secretary-Treasurer, Howard University.
- SHEPPARD, SENATOR MORRIS, LL.D.
United States Senator.
- SHRIVER, REV. WILLIAM P., D.D.
Director, City, Immigrant and Industrial Work of Board of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.
- TALBOT, RT. REV. ETHELBERT, D.D., LL.D.
Senior Bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church.
- WESTFALL, MRS. KATHERINE S.
Executive Secretary, Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society.
- WHITE, REV. LUKE
Rector of St. Luke's Church, Montclair, New Jersey.
- WOODRUFF, MRS. MAY LEONARD
Corresponding Secretary, Woman's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church.
- ZAHNISER, REV. CHARLES R., Ph.D.
Executive Secretary, Pittsburgh Council of the Churches of Christ.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Homes	2
Problems of Youth	5
The Church and the Dependent, Neglected, Defective and Delinquent.....	7
Poverty and Pauperism	7
Temperance and Prohibition	8
Prisoners and Crime.....	11
The Day of Rest and Worship.....	12
The Use of Leisure	13
Race Relations	15
Health and Sanitation	17
Alliance with Charity and Philanthropy	18
Social Science	19
Bibliography	20

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL AND MORAL PROBLEMS

The Christian Church of America has not given attention to social and moral problems until within recent years, nor are all parts of that church yet satisfied that these problems legitimately come within the range of the church's care and function. In its main streams and deposits the colonization of America was a dissent from social responsibility, as it was a break from control, religious and social, whether of church or state. The standards of freedom, which the colonists were seeking, meant for most of them pure individualism as a philosophy. As they believed in the right of private judgment and the responsibility of the individual to his own conscience alone, so also they believed that the mission of the Church was to minister chiefly to individuals and that the message of the Gospel, preached to every creature, would encompass the salvation of souls one by one, plucking each out of a sinful and corrupt state for transference by a new birth into citizenship in a new commonwealth, the Kingdom of God, in which the rest of the world, carnal and of the flesh fleshly could have no part.

Although the Puritans in their first compact, drawn up in the cabin of the "Mayflower," for the formation of a government, recognized religion as obligatory in the realm of human relations, yet to the majority of the early Christians in America there were no social and moral problems in the modern sense. All problems of every nature of religion, of man in this world, and as he hoped for the next, were theological and doctrinal. The most earnest Christian believers, the soundest theologians and expounders of the faith, stoutly maintained that all desired and prayed for changes in the social fabric and its moral conditions, which were within the scope of the divine dispensation for realization upon the earth, would be secured through the process of preaching the Gospel to individuals, and that as individuals became soundly converted to God, the Kingdom of God would be established and built up among men.

The proclamation of the Gospel of individual redemption, which appeals to the individual to seek the salvation of his own soul for an immortal and blessed destiny, when successful among individuals, exerts a continuous and effective influence toward social redemption and the reconstruction of society through various social and moral reforms, for even one individual, when transformed, by a saving power within him, into a new creature, alters by the full extent of his own influence and personality the society of which he is a part, and the cumulative results of improving the individual units of which society is composed may profoundly change the whole structure of society and solve most, if not all, of its moral problems.

The story of what the Christian Church in America has done, as she has become aware of social and moral problems, is really a story of how the men and women of the churches, without consciously realizing that there is such a thing as a "Social Gospel", and that they were in any technical sense exemplifying an "Applied Christianity," were giving expression in a natural and naive way to the principles of Jesus as they found them, almost each for himself, in the New Testament and tried to incorporate them each for himself in his own life and in society.

Homes :

So long as America was largely rural and chiefly agricultural, the home was her social safeguard and her social center.

A home, then, consisted of one woman and one man, united in wedlock, partners in the business of life, occupying a building, or a set of buildings, separated by ample, and in some instances by long distances from neighbors, and surrounded with numerous children, who, as they became large enough, helped in nearly all of the tasks in which father and mother were engaged. These were real social units, of the best sort, thrifty, frugal, self-contained, independent, sharing each other's experiences, finding sport and amusement in wholesome relations with neighbors, or at the village, which might be near or far. Even the larger communities, which might be termed cities, in the earlier days, were characterized by similar habits of simplicity, economy and virtue. The Sunday was then observed as a day of rest and worship. Practically everybody went to church. Church services had social and educational values, which everybody prized, and religion was regarded with respect even by those who did not "profess" it.

When America became industrialized and the population became chiefly urban, these simple and rural traits became less common, and in large sections entirely disappeared.

America, probably as no other country in the world, has been hospitable to strangers, receiving within her gates men and women and children from all corners of the globe, who brought strange tongues, different habits, and other standards of living. They came at first by hundreds and were readily accommodated and soon assimilated as integral parts of the communities in which they settled. They took on American ways and usually delighted in becoming Americans. But soon these foreigners came by thousands and even by millions. They settled in communities by themselves, in many instances crowding out former residents by the invasion of unfamiliar speech and conduct and the economic pressure of their lower standards of living.

Then the simple and wholesome ways became in many places wholly impossible. Housing accommodations became inadequate; overcrowding resulted; the evils of tenements, of slums, of congestion, of unsanitary conditions and of immoral practices appeared. What has been called the "continental Sunday" crept in to take the place of the American Sunday. The low dance-hall became too common. Gambling dives, dram-shops, resorts for degrading amusements and similar evils made their bids for patronage and in too many instances prospered. In the larger cities there have not been wanting men who would exploit these new comers and by disregard of law and decency prostitute them to servile political purposes and to ends of benefit only to the demagogues themselves.

America's rapid settlement and her great industrial development have been augmented by her immigration policy, and while the blending of national types has been an important factor in shaping the American character, yet her hospitality to immigrants has had its complications. Thereby her social and moral problems have been multiplied and intensified many times. There is a community of interests which every nation and race on

the earth must share with America. The very cosmopolitan character of her people makes her problems of concern to all the world besides.

The Christians of America have attempted to preserve the home. It has not been an easy task. Better economic conditions are a help, but alas! too frequently better wages and larger incomes have but resulted in greater extravagance, a craving for more luxury and more excitement, and the home has not benefitted. The inexpensive and easy means of transportation into the suburbs have relieved to some considerable degree the evils of overcrowding, and of tenements, and of slums. But unfortunately the high cost of building has stopped the erection of houses and the resulting high rents bring about a period of congestion and suffering, unsanitary, unsocial and immoral.

The congested slum districts of the larger cities have received much attention, increasing through the more recent years. Voluntary organizations have been formed for the purpose of first making investigations and then of securing improvement. Legislation has been enacted limiting the size of buildings in proportion to the land occupied, fixing the amount of light and air to be provided, and prescribing rules and regulations for sanitary conditions and observances. Recently, protective legislation has dealt with the economic side of the housing problem, seeking to prevent injustice to tenants by high rentals, by unmerciful evictions, by lack of heating in the winter, by hazard to life through faulty construction or lack of fire-escapes.

In all of these movements the church, in some instances as an organization, but more frequently through her members as individuals, has manifested interest and sympathy, and at times leadership. The church, however, is still cautious about directing her testimony and her ministries into the channels of material comforts and economic conditions.

Generally the Christians of America have been resolutely set against easy divorce,—many of the clergy standing for divorce solely on the one Scriptural ground, of adultery. But the mixed conditions, of many peoples and many standards, of which America is composed, have been too strong, and some states of the American commonwealth have become notorious for the ease and number of divorces granted.

In one state only, South Carolina, the laws make no provision whatever for divorce. In all other states of the Union, with varying degrees of ease, legalized separation, for a great variety of causes, is permissible and the number of divorces has greatly increased. Through the officials of many of the states and by representatives of Bar Associations a movement has been in progress for several years looking toward uniform laws on the subject or a possible transfer of authority to the Federal Courts, but no real and definite conclusions have been arrived at in these directions. In the meantime it is evident that there is a profound and widespread social conviction taking shape, beneath the legal, religious and purely individualistic considerations with which this subject is involved, that the family, as a social unit, and society as a whole, are deeply concerned and that considerations, greater than those which affect one man and one woman, must be weighed and must be determinative in the final conclusion. It is perhaps fair to say that the American Church, speaking of it as a whole, with as near and

impartial judgment as is possible, less and less regards the few New Testament injunctions upon this subject as final and more and more believes that the spirit and principles of Jesus in the midst of modern conditions would regard the whole subject more from the point of view of social welfare than from the point of view of a single individual act, even though that act be so serious as adultery.

The American conscience has been fairly successful in combatting the Social Evil, at least as to outward show and public business. In no part of America is prostitution licensed as a recognized trade; in not more than a dozen American cities is there still a segregated vice district. Coincident with the abolishment of segregated districts, provision has been made for the care of infected persons and the restoration of prostitutes. In this remarkable movement, which has taken place within a generation, the Church has had a large part in the education of public opinion. In Cleveland, Ohio, for example, the entire effort originated with the Federated Churches. The Chicago Vice Commission originated with church workers. The laws of the United States deal severely with the conveying of women for immoral purposes either into the country, or out of it, or between the states of the Union. These laws are well enforced.

Within recent years there has been a pronounced movement toward imparting to young people at an early age suitable and wholesome instruction in matters pertaining to sex so that they may acquire, at a time to be of use to them, and prevent impure and perverted notions coming first, knowledge of their bodies and their natures and of the divine way of preserving and reproducing our own species. In this connection quite a considerable list of useful books have been published and many public school teachers are interested in teaching and in safeguarding their pupils.

Unfortunately recent fiction has over emphasized problems of sex,—perhaps, however, not wholly without some good effects,—the moving pictures have shown too many films depicting passion, lust and situations involving sex, and the public mind has had more open knowledge of such subjects as these thrust upon it, but certainly a reaction has set in. The public conscience is demanding a more rigid, and at the same time a reasonable, censorship and the tendency of American thought is positively in the direction of giving adequate knowledge, preventing prurient displays and of purifying social customs and ways.

It must not be overlooked that the sanctity and even the perpetuity of the American home is seriously threatened. Marriage is deferred in all too many instances until late in life for the sake of setting up a home, when it is founded, on a scale of luxury, not to say extravagance, comparable with that of the parents. Marriage then becomes too frequently a matter "of convenience." The entrance of women into business and into the professions, wholesome from the point of view of independence and self-realization, nevertheless tends to make the home appear to many less desirable and to give occasion more easily to disregard its claims and to set aside its restraints. The course for the Church to pursue is not clearly perceived.

The problems of the home in America today are many and serious. Among them may be named the following:

The emancipation of women, affecting the relations of the sexes, without as yet furnishing an understanding of its meaning;

The high cost of living, with scarcely any abatement as yet in view, accompanied with a passion for luxury, extravagance and display, all of which deter people from entering into matrimony and of attempting to keep a home together;

Easy recourse to divorce proceedings, thereby losing the chastening and purifying processes of forbearance and compromise;

Time enough has elapsed to indicate that the free treatment given to matters of sex in fiction, on the stage, in the moving pictures, in the daily news and even in formal instruction has had a damaging rather than a beneficial effect on the young and has been undermining the virtue and stability of the home.

Problems of Youth

Efforts to surround children and young people with safeguards against evil companions and vicious influence and inculcate in them at as early an age as possible the principle of the Christian religion have been carried as far in America as in any country of the world.

The Sunday School, or Bible School, or School of Religious Instruction, as it has variously been termed, has received the labors of some of the ablest and most devoted members of the Church, both directly in and through church organizations, and by means of outside, voluntary organizations, and branches and activities of which have reached into the smallest communities, have spread over states, throughout the nation and into the mission fields and the nations of the world.

Specialized organizations, like the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association, have gathered the young people of the two sexes and their friends into effective groups, working each for its kind, with friendliness and assistance to help toward the full development of the body, of the mind and of the spiritual nature. Upon these organizations have been lavished great stores of wealth and of personal devotion, under the sanction and with the approval of the Church.

The Young People's Christian Endeavor Society and similar bodies of young people have sought to mobilize and guide the consecration and endeavors of young people themselves into the avenues of wholesome Christian experience, sane and beneficial recreations and amusements, and useful ministries to the Church and to society.

The Scout movement, both for boys and for girls has extended and applied these efforts a bit further into sports and out-door activities and into acquaintance with nature and her secrets.

The Church has been more than a sponsor for these movements. They have originated, in almost every instance, within the councils of the Church; they have never departed far from the Church; they have been fostered by the Church,—not however without some misgivings in some quarters, it is true, but, with a general endorsement and consent which has made them at length real allies of the Church.

These organizations are large, well officered, generously financed, efficient and among the most honored of any America possesses.

The tendency of the American Church is to be less strict with its young people than it formerly was, and to place more confidence in them. A large number of congregations, constantly increasing, have parish houses, or community houses, or buildings bearing a variety of designations, designed almost exclusively for the use of young people, for their religious education and services of fellowship and worship on Sunday, and for a great variety of social and recreational purposes on the week days and evenings. In these houses are the implements for many games and frequently a well equipped gymnasium. Many other congregations, lacking sufficient resources for separate buildings, devote the basement of the meeting house, or some addition, or special space, to the same kinds of uses, believing that pastimes and amusements, sane and wholesome, are necessary for the normal boy and girl, and that these should be found under the auspices and with the approval of the Church, rather than outside her precincts and supervision.

There are several organizations whose aims and activities are directed toward furnishing proper opportunities for and guiding the play instincts of youth and providing programs in communities for the good use of leisure time by adults. The Church is in sympathy with such organizations and movements.

Among the outstanding problems concerning the youth of America may be mentioned the following:

America is still experimenting in the field of secular education, as to subjects to be taught, as to psychological and pedagogical methods to be employed, as to the relations of the sexes particularly in the upper grades and higher institutions, as to the responsibility of State and Church and their relations in the field of education and as to the ultimate ideals to be sought throughout the entire process.

An adequate program of religious education is yet to be worked out and agreed upon.

The youth movement in America, although stirring—as it must—in normal, developing minds, has not assumed political significance as in some countries of Europe. College young people live for the most part, normal lives in friendly relations in the community in which the educational institutions are located. It may be that less attention is given to the various pursuits of study, and excessive interests and energies are consumed in athletics and in competitions between colleges. There are, however, operative influences, which promise to steady and bring to due proportion these energies and interests.

Opportunities for amusement and recreation, sufficient in number, accessible in location and suitable in character must be provided; this is not always possible in modern cities, and is no less difficult to provide in many rural districts;

How to preserve and cultivate the spirit of free initiative, through undirected play and by means of some modern equivalent of the old apprenticeship system, when the son worked with his father and the novice was at the side of the master-workman, is a serious problem.

The age-long problem faces the Church of keeping the forms of religious expression fresh and vital, adapted to youth, renewed and changed, with

changing conditions, while at the same time the permanent spiritual content is preserved.

The Church and the Dependent, Neglected, Defective and Delinquent:

The Church has furnished the ideals and the incentives very largely for the care of the unfortunate and the handicapped of every kind, but has not, as a rule, herself, as an organization, undertaken to care for them. The State makes provision for the feeble-minded, their education and their custody, and for the insane, although there are some private institutions serving both classes, chiefly, however, on a commercial rather than a charitable basis.

In recent years the different states of the Union have made provision for the education and industrial training of the competent blind.

For children, either orphans or those whose homes are inadequate, there is a large number of homes and asylums, conducted according to a variety of ideals and plans, but usually supported by private charity, springing almost entirely from the Church.

Care is taken to prevent these refuges and asylums from becoming institutionalized by customs and rules, which would crush out initiative and individuality. As fast as children become advanced enough in age and education, it is more and more the policy to place them out in normal, private homes, but still under the inspection and supervision of the central administration.

Many homes for the aged and infirm have open doors for both men and women, whose years and circumstances render them incapable of caring longer for themselves and for whom no relatives can make provision. These, too, usually rest upon private endowments and continuing gifts of the living and are generally connected with or spring from the Church, though not controlled by the Church. Roman Catholics, more than Protestants, have these institutions under Church auspices and control.

As Society at large has become more humane, more merciful and more thoroughly permeated with the spirit of Jesus, it has seemed as though the service of the Church in these fields of ministry and care could under ordinary circumstances be best rendered by cooperating with institutions which have been established, and maintained, by the State.

Poverty and Pauperism

Christians have always been generous. Although they seek to save themselves, yet their earliest and most continuous teaching is that they shall think of, shall serve and shall love others. The example of the Master is ever before them; He "went about doing good"; He "was filled with compassion"; He "showed pity."

In an individualistic way the Christians of America, under the teaching and sanction of their churches have distributed food and clothing and help of every kind to the poor.

But the systematic care of the poor has, as a rule, been delegated to charity organizations and the State, or the Town; and "Poor Farms,"

“Work Houses” and similar institutions have grown up, as the place of refuge for those, overtaken by poverty, who have no friends able and willing to care for them. The Church, having with good conscience freed itself of this responsibility, has unfortunately given little further heed to these needy people. Too often the feeble-minded, the lazy, the sick, the young and the aged have been huddled together in conditions unsanitary, inhumane and vicious, the only excuse for which has been inexpensiveness.

Gradually the generous and wiser impulses of the Church have been aroused for the care of the very young and of the very aged, and these two classes have been separated out from the other paupers and housed in comfortable and altogether suitable homes and asylums for them, provided in many instances by voluntary offerings coming from the Church and its people, or stimulated and controlled by them.

The better care of the pauper sick has been chiefly in hospitals maintained by state and municipal governments; and yet in these recent years, many of the Church communions have entered into this field of ministering to the sick.

Some churches have undertaken to deal with the problem of unemployment and to find work for those who need it. The tendency, however, is to render this social service either through private employment agencies or, in times of special need, through temporary bureaus established by the government.

There is a decided tendency in America for the churches of all Protestant communions to enter into these fields of service, particularly through establishing homes for children and for the aged, and hospitals for the sick.

Temperance and Prohibition

The first efforts at reforming the drunkard and removing the curse of drink were aimed at the individual in an effort to get him to sign the pledge of total abstinence. Many strikingly successful campaigns were held. The Church, if not the originator of these movements, was nearly always a close and sympathetic cooperator, and her edifices were open and her services given over to these efforts. Great good was accomplished by these appeals, and some of the most eminent people of their times were the apostles of these temperance movements, advocates of “moral suasion” and of “signing the pledge.”

By a hard tutelage and a slow process, the lesson was learned that the individual could seldom stand alone in his fight against appetite, the pull of bad companions and the corrupt practices of a nefarious business. The evils of intemperance were discovered to be almost wholly social, and many people became convinced,—though but slowly and with seeming reluctance—that the only effective remedy possible was also social.

Women, at first as praying bands, which later became organized into the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, were the pioneers in attempting to close the liquor saloons and tippling places and dealing with the evil in a social way and as more than an individual wrong. They succeeded in having introduced into the laws of practically all the states a requirement for the compulsory teaching of the evils of the use of alcohol. This instruc-

tion, doubtless, had a very large part in developing an intelligent public opinion leading up to the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment. The record of their achievements and continuing influence inspired other movements and the formation of other associations of men as well as of women. The Good Templars became conspicuous at one time.

In the way of legislation against the manufacture, the transportation, the sale and the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, the State of Maine became a beginning almost three quarters of a century ago. A third of a century later, Kansas and other States of the Middle West ventured upon the experiment, at first timidly and with some vacillation. Then the principle of "local option" gained sway, and towns and counties in all parts of the country, essayed prohibition within their boundaries, only to find after a time that the "wet border" of a neighboring community was their undoing.

Various attempts have been made to bring the question into partisan politics; but the larger national parties have been unwilling to espouse the cause. Then it became the platform of a "Third Party," with varying ups and downs, but with no pronounced success. For more than forty years a Prohibition Party, usually with a scant but zealous following, has endeavored to win the support of the electorate and make prohibition the policy of the nation. Loyal and consecrated people went throughout the land proclaiming the doctrine of prohibition by statutory law and by amendment to the constitution of the states. Much literature was printed and distributed. As an educational force the party method was of value. Gradually and steadily the conviction was spreading and strengthening that "the saloon must go" and that the power of the whiskey ring, in the politics of the cities and of the nation, must be broken. States and counties and towns placed themselves under the prohibition standard and the extent of "dry territory," at first gradually, and later rapidly, increased.

When the Anti-Saloon League was organized in 1893, it declared its purpose to unite all persons opposed to the beverage liquor traffic in an "inter-denominational and omni-partisan" fellowship, and while not co-operating with nor antagonizing any party as such it bent all its energies to elect to public office the candidates of all parties favorable to progressive legislation and its enforcement and to keep the records of public officials impartially before their constituencies. The Anti-Saloon League received the support of nearly all of the communions and was recognized as the agent of the churches. Under its direction the policy of prohibition made steady advance, gaining towns, counties and states, until the XVIIIth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was adopted, providing the means whereby the Nation, as a whole, became subject to total prohibition of the traffic of intoxicating liquors as a beverage.

The Christian conscience of the Church of America is largely responsible for this result. The War had brought the issue into bold prominence. Labor must be efficient, but labor was being demoralized by drink. Everywhere the effect of drink upon the Negro race and others was feared. The tremendous economic loss had become apparent. East and West, North and South, with surprising unanimity, called for the Amendment, and the laws and their enforcement; but the one dominating factor throughout the entire country was the sentiment of the churches, crystallized in the action of the Anti-Saloon League.

The Christian Church realized that the enactment of laws and the embodiment of a principle in the constitution of the land do not at once produce sobriety and virtue. Arrayed against the enforcement and seeking in every possible way its discrediting and ultimate overthrow are many men and many motives,—those who wish to do business for gain, those whose appetites and passions crave indulgence, those who are heedless of moral ends and in a spirit of bravado like to violate law as in itself a kind of mental stimulant, those who would use and debauch the natures of men for their own political purposes. Vast moneyed interests are at stake. the Christian Church and the moral people of America have upon their hands a warfare for righteousness which will not be slight and may not be brief. America is attempting a great moral reform, of world-wide significance, and in it she needs the support of the moral and religious influences of all lands.

We are aware that other nations of the world are involved with us. From them come now much of the liquor which the smuggler and the boot-legger sell. The convictions and sentiment of other nations help to weaken or strengthen the determination of our own people. The success or failure, which we secure in America, will have a bearing upon the legislation and upon the habits of all of the world.

The prohibitory law is undergoing a severe trial. Three States, New York, New Jersey and Rhode Island, either by legislative enactment, or by act of the Chief Executive have openly set at naught the Constitution and the laws of the Federal Government. There are good people, some in leading positions in political life, some prominent as educators and in other high callings, and even some clergymen, who do not hesitate to deplore, if not to denounce the Amendment and the laws, averring that they are too drastic and untimely and predicting that they can never be enforced. And yet, in the midst of the controversy, the officials at Washington, both in the Administration and in Congress, defend and stand by the law almost unanimously. The conclusion is irresistible that the astute politicians of both parties are convinced that the conscience of the majority of the people of the United States has gone into the enactment of these policies and that the people are determined to carry them through.

It may fairly be said that the opposition to the policy of prohibition is strongest and most vociferous in the larger cities on the Atlantic seaboard, while the South, the Middle West, the Far West and the Northwest are stoutest in favor of the laws and their enforcement. Another way of stating the division of sentiment is this:—where the native born stock is the prevailing population, prohibition is in favor and in those sections where the foreign-born are the most numerous the opposition is pronounced. In some aspects then, the problem in America is due to a conflict of ideals from opposite sides of the ocean.

(In view of the world-wide interest in the operation of the American National Prohibition Law, of certain widespread misconceptions concerning the same, and of the desire on the part of many to have the latest available accurate information bearing upon that question, an authoritative supplementary statement will be issued for distribution at the Conference in Stockholm, concerning the principles underlying that law, the factors which

operated to secure its enactment, the immediate results which followed its adoption, and the probable ultimate effect upon the social order, not only in the United States, but in other countries of the world.)

Prisoners and Crime

One of the darker pages in the social history of the Church is that in which its seeming indifference to all classes of misdemeanants and all subjects connected with crime, penology and reformation is written. This is a record of neglect. Jails and prisons have been left almost entirely to politicians and to government agents.

Society has been permitted to struggle with various experiments,—with the Pennsylvania System of solitary confinement in idleness, with the Auburn System of group control and employment, with the Elmira System of attempted reform and parole,—while the Church has continued to preach an individual sin and salvation only to those who came within her walls. A pamphlet describing prison systems in operation in the United States at this time is in process of preparation and will be published and distributed at the time of the conference.

Here and there individuals, members of churches, but acting chiefly upon their own responsibility and initiative, have seen the need of this class of unfortunates and have given unstinted and invaluable service to their care.

Tardily even the Commission on Church and Social Service has taken up this form of service and brought the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America into contact with the problems and a sane and rational attempt at their solution.

Several large and important questions loom up in this connection.

To what extent is the violator of law responsible for his acts? Is he a victim of heredity? Was he properly cared for in youth? Was the environment in which he grew up itself a breeder of crime? What influences surrounded him at school, or in the years when he should have been at school? Is he the unfortunate sufferer from some physical or mental disorder which predisposes him in wrong doing? To what extent is the Church responsible for his wrong doing?

On what basis should criminals be classified and segregated?

What are the proper social motives for the punishment of crime?

How should prisons and jails be constructed? Who should be responsible for the care, administration and inspection of them?

What should be done for the discharged prisoner's social reassimilation and rehabilitation?

Whether capital punishment is ever justifiable has become an open, moot question with many people in America. Juries are less liable than formerly to bring in verdicts which have the death penalty attached; judges and other court officers tend toward leniency in urging punishment and in sentencing the convicted; the public frequently shows a disposition to become sentimental in the face of a great crime and of a daring criminal. It would almost seem at times as though the craze for sensations and for notoriety were moving causes in the minds of the degenerate and ill-balanced for the

commission of an outstanding, appalling crime. In this connection the responsibility of the newspapers, which spread abroad the noisome details, is pointed out and they are noted as the makers of opinion and, by suggestiveness, the schoolmasters in crime.

The Day of Rest and Worship—

The place of Sunday as the day of rest was at first unchallenged in America. In many of the colonies and in most of the states it became hedged about by laws, that prohibited many of the activities which are now regarded as absolutely essential to the comfortable existence of Society under modern conditions. Yet in most cases the old laws, known as "Blue Laws,"—stand upon the statute books. No one wishes to change them, because no one seems quite ready to indicate how they should be changed so as to preserve that which is important and let go the outgrown features. We have, then, in America an abundance of law to protect and preserve Sunday as the day of rest and worship. The day is generally pretty well observed; but there is considerable disregard of Sunday laws as such.

There are four pronounced influences in the country, which make it very difficult for us to determine the kind of day we should have and how to secure it:—

The Jews are more numerous in America than in any other country in the world. They would observe Saturday as the Sabbath, and yet, because Sunday is the legal day of rest, their tendency is to observe no day or at least not so to observe it as to make themselves influential in social customs, save to break down the observance of Sunday.

There are Christian sects which seek to restore Saturday as the holy day of rest and worship on Scriptural grounds. They and the Jews are entitled to religious freedom, and consequently the practice in America has been tolerant with both groups, when they have substituted one day for the other, and lenient even when there has been desecration of one without honoring the other.

The practice of Roman Catholics, after faithful attention to religious obligations in the forenoon, then to devote Sunday afternoon to pastime and in some instances to secular pursuits, has had a confusing and disturbing influence upon the observances of the day, which might otherwise be maintained under Protestant and Puritan sanction.

Into America have come a host of people from other lands, where some other day, or no day at all, has been observed with religious significance; and in communities in which the newcomers have predominated, naturally the rest day disappeared, or became prostituted to other purposes.

Then as the population of the country has become more and more urbanized the need of complete change from city to country, has stimulated flight to the parks, to the woods, to the seashore, to the golf links, and to all sorts of pastime and sport, with a consequent commercialization of the day because it offered large financial gains to systems of transportation, to hotels and restaurants, and to all purveyors of pastime and amusement.

There are large and long established organizations for the protection of the day of rest, which are making careful investigations of grounds

upon which the day may be justified and the ways of securing its better observance. These organizations are for the most part distinctly created and sustained by the Church.

The Use of Leisure

We have not, however, explained the social and moral problems connected with the use of leisure, when we have dealt with the day of rest and worship. It is necessary to go further.

There was a time when lotteries were authorized by state governments and were permitted to send their printed matter through the mails to all parts of the country. Those times are past. But betting, gambling and the playing of various kinds of games of chance, frequently with various kinds of devices, have become all too common and threaten to be a national vice. Travellers on steamships and by railroad trains wager money or set up pools, on trifling matters, whether it be the day's run of a vessel, the quickness of a porter in making up a berth, or the speed of the train between stations. The national sports, yachting, horse racing, baseball, football, tennis, golf, all become occasions for the placing of long bets, which the papers do not hesitate to publish as news gratifying to the public. Students in some colleges and high schools are carried away with this distemper as by a mania. At election times the chances of candidates to win at the polls are often estimated by the amount of money which partisans are willing to wager. Bets at some times are quoted as stock market prices are quoted, to indicate the condition of the country.

Problems of this kind are arising in threatening aspect. Too long the fashionable part of American society has dabbled in the lesser forms of betting and gambling,—making small ventures in games at parties and social functions. Even the Church has been known to permit questionable affairs at sales and other gatherings under her auspices, selling chances on dolls and cakes, and watches, and automobiles, permitting grab-bags and other schemes, which savored wholly of chance and naught of skill or industry or of any honest equivalent for the object sought.

The American conscience as a whole has not yet been awakened to the peril of these evils, nor to the insidious way in which they are making inroads into the habits of the people.

These are evils of far reach, throughout many lands and among many peoples and call for the united efforts of the Christians of all churches. Sound principles of economy and ethics fortify those who seek to make men more honest, more thrifty, more frugal, more conscientious in toil and in exchange.

The right of leisure in America has many advocates with divergent views and varying motives and is threatened with many perils.

Labor organizations have generally insisted upon one day in seven for rest, and the Church and Labor have worked together for this object, generally with success. Recently some of the great industries of the country, like iron, steel and paper plants, which on economic grounds seemed obliged to keep the continuous operation, have conceded the eight-hour

shift and the weekly day of rest to their employees. Certainly workmen in all industries should receive for six days of labor adequate compensation to maintain themselves and their families for the seven days of the week.

The great national game, baseball, has long insisted that it should be permitted to entertain the people on Sunday. In some cities and in some states this is allowed, and the largest crowds of the week attend the Sunday ball games. Even in communities in which it is not legally permitted, it is played upon the vacant lots and in the not distant suburbs, so that the quiet of the day and the peace of mind of many church worshippers are disturbed. Other amusements and sports clamor for like recognition and toleration, in some parts of the country horse racing, in all parts of the country—golf, automobiling and resorting to amusement parks by the sea, the rivers and lakes. The evils of these places arise not from what nature offers, but from the crowds and the vices which have been introduced, because profitable to the vendors of them. There are organized movements, even great corporations, having large vested interests, which undertake for profit to pander to the lower appetites of men in their hours of leisure.

Moving picture shows have spread through the country almost like wild fire. Scarcely a hamlet is without one at least. Their tendency in the past has not been on the whole wholesome, but an improvement has set in. Educators, parents, social workers and municipal governments have been aroused, and, while legal censorship is not common, nevertheless a kind of public censorship has become effective in many communities. In some people there has developed a kind of mania for attending shows, which presents some aspects of intoxication or of the drug habit. Yet better pictures and pictures used for higher purposes are becoming the rule.

The tendency in America is for the Church to raise the ban upon social dancing and for municipalities to regulate and restrict the places for public dancing with greater care.

Libraries, reading rooms and museums are open more hours on work-days in the evenings and on Sundays than in the past and are frequented by more people with every passing year. There is a very gratifying tendency, fostered by many organizations, to return to nature, to get out into the open, to take hikes, to botanize, to study animals, minerals, antiquities. This urge for knowledge, more or less tinged with the scientific spirit, is one of the most wholesome and notable influences making for the right use of leisure in the American life.

The use of the radio, perhaps, to be regarded as a temporary fad, has become, at least for the present, almost a national passion. If it be claimed by some that there is a tendency to substitute the listening in on sermons for actual attendance at church, yet to others experience has shown that the message of the Church can be carried through this medium to those who could not, or would not, come to her services.

In all parts of the country local churches and some denominations as a policy, are establishing, under various designations, parish houses, neighborhood houses and community houses, which are employed for the recreation, the entertainment and the social purposes of the neighborhood or community.

There is an increasing disposition to regard the furnishing of wholesome recreation as a legitimate function of the church, and the gospel more and more is conceived of and proclaimed as a purifying, energizing and constructive message to the whole of man.

Race Relations

The presence of many races and nationalities in the United States has produced serious problems in human relationships that create unusual tasks and opportunities for the churches. Some of these problems are incidental to a process of adjustment, as group after group assimilates itself to the general pattern of western culture and civilization, a process already advancing towards a realization of national harmony. Other problems, derived from more deep-seated inter-racial attitudes, have their roots in historical antagonisms and marked physical differences. Both types of problems in varied forms confront the home mission efforts and introduce complications into the whole structure and activities of the churches. The following population figures will give a clue to the basic facts: According to the last Census, there were in 1920, in a total population of 105,700,000

- 10,460,000 Negroes (including all degrees of mixed white and Negro blood);
- 350,000 American Indians;
- 500,000 Asiatics (Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Indians, Persians, Armenians);
- 14,000,000 other foreign-born and speaking foreign languages;
- 21,000,000 American-born children of foreign-born;
- 4,000,000 Jews.

Not all the foreign-born groups present the same problems. In the case of the European-born immigrants and their children, assimilation on the whole is completed with the use of the English language for ordinary intercourse, adoption of American customs and manners and acquisition of American citizenship with a full regard for its duties and privileges—a process usually taking from two to three generations. Special home mission treatment is required more especially for the immigrants of the first generation and their children.

There has been a gradual change of emphasis in the work done by the churches on behalf of the Jewish population. While the Jew adapts himself quickly to American ways, socially and economically, he remains separate racially and culturally, no matter for how many generations he has been in America. Inter-marriage between Jews and Gentiles is on the increase. Generally, however, there is evidence in their relations of a sense of difference, if not actual prejudice, wherever Jews are found in considerable numbers. Efforts at evangelization have not been very effective; mission work among the Jews usually meets with open hostility. The antagonism of Jews against Gentiles is chiefly religious and racial, and resentment against various forms of special discrimination; that of Gentiles against Jews is more largely social and economic—though the religious animosity survives—and is due to the rapidity with which Jews acquire prosperity as against the slowness with which, in common with other groups, they grasp and share the

prevailing cultural habits and ideals. In these circumstances, the churches more and more direct their program to the disarming of prejudice on both sides rather than immediate proselytism. There is every evidence that these newer efforts are effective in countering prejudicial propaganda on both sides.

The Christianization of the American Indian has been rendered difficult by neglect and exploitation. While progress has been made in some sections, it is hindered in others by the dispersion of the Indians in small settlements. On the other hand, owing to this isolation and to their relatively small numbers, the Indians do not meet with as much antagonism on the part of whites as might be anticipated from their strangeness in appearance and customs. For example, there is no legal restriction on the intermarriage of whites and Indians, and any Indian who wishes to do so may become an American citizen.

The half million Asiatics in the United States constitute not only a domestic problem but also a problem for foreign policy because of the national complications involved by their presence. More especially the relations between the United States and Japan have been embarrassed more than once by the race antagonism stirred up against the Japanese on the Pacific Coast. The home mission agencies have a definite program not only for evangelizing and adjusting these Asiatics but also for the creation of good-will between them and their white neighbors.

The outstanding American problem in race relations is, of course, that between whites and Negroes, with its heritage from the days of slavery. The emancipation of four million slaves during the Civil War, yet within living memory, did not permanently ensure for them and their descendants equal citizenship rights. On the other hand, the exercise of the franchise in the years immediately following the war, by former slaves unprepared for the responsibilities of citizenship, left their mark on the attitude of the white South. With the aid primarily of the churches and of northern philanthropists, and in recent years also with that of progressive and well-disposed Southerners, the Negroes have made rapid progress in economic, cultural and religious development. Their efforts for self-improvement have won the admiration and active assistance of white Americans.

In this growing appreciation for the Negro, an increasing migration of the race from the country to the cities and from the South to the North has played its part. The world war, with its sudden demand for an increased industrial labor supply, greatly accelerated this migration. Unfortunately, the demand for Negro labor has not as yet become constant but is fluctuating; and even in those centers where Negroes have made their homes in large numbers, the provision of adequate housing, educational and other facilities for them has remained an exception, with the result that opportunities to earn higher wages have not yet brought commensurate advantages. Of course, the depletion of the supply of cheap colored labor in the South has had the effect of improving also the appreciation of Negro workers who have remained in the South. The number of lynchings and other attacks upon life, health and property has decreased. In the matter of social intercourse, the old dead line between the races practically remains unbroken; and it must be chronicled that the increase of the Negroes in the North has brought with it sharper discrimination in this respect than existed formerly. The increase in the number of industrially employed Negroes is generally

regarded unfavorably by white wage-earners, and advancement from the less to the more skilled forms of employment is difficult.

In all this advancement, the churches have taken a conspicuous part. The religious care of the Negro population is, to a large extent, a home mission obligation, more especially because the social cleavage between white and colored is so great that the two races rarely worship in the same congregation. By far the larger part of the Negro population is attached to the Baptist and several branches of the Methodist Episcopal churches. For some decades there has been a marked growth of independent Negro church bodies, which now embrace nearly nine-tenths of Negro church members.

As a result of these influences, the Negro race is producing not only its own religious leadership but also its own leadership in other concerns, so that further internal progress of the Negro group in America and their relations to the white group is largely bound up with the future of the Negro churches and the growing strength of Negro leadership.

The home mission boards of the country have taken the initiative in providing Negroes, as well as immigrant populations, with opportunities for social and health education. Large sums are expended by them in maintaining schools, colleges and seminaries for the training of Negro teachers, physicians, lawyers and other professions as well as ministers. The public school authorities and schools supported by Negroes themselves are now providing educational facilities for a rapidly increasing proportion of the colored population, thus setting home mission resources in part free for other services. Very little provision is as yet made for higher education of Negroes throughout the South, so that the major burden of providing for it falls upon the churches.

In regard to all the problems mentioned in these paragraphs, there is a noticeable increase of efforts to create a better understanding and cooperation between the different groups. There is a decided trend of policy to work *with* these various groups rather than *for* them. Old established discriminations are sharply challenged by the churches, and practically every denomination is in process of enlarging and refining its educational program for applying Christian principles to race relations.

Health and Sanitation:

The physical welfare of people has not received from the Church consistent attention until very recent times. Too long has "the flesh" been associated with "the world" and "the devil" for it to be regarded by the theologians as the source of any good. But common people did at length learn through experience that the conditions of the body did affect conditions of mind and spirit, and they discovered that the best estate of man and woman must rest upon health and sound physical conditions. These lessons, however, came very slowly. Volumes could be written upon the folly of attempting to improve the souls of men, while their lungs were diseased, or their bodies were shivering with cold and starving for lack of food.

Crowded tenement districts, reeking slums, inadequate sewerage, impure water, foul air, epidemics, contagious diseases,—these are still but phrases, devoid of a religious content to most church members, and yet the Church is beginning to take notice of these things, through specialized workers, by means of committees and commissions and as a part of the expanding pro-

gram of those churches which have awakened to the social needs of a city environment.

The Church has always believed in prayer for the sick, and in some instances in anointing by oil and the laying on of hands. But when the Christian Science cult arose a few years ago and so speedily won its thousands of adherents, many churches began to realize that they had been leaving out of their message a part of the Gospel meaning for the bodies and physical environs of men.

America has suffered from a multitude of weird and fantastic notions respecting health and healing, some of them promoted by people who profess a religious faith and claim to accomplish marvelous results through the assistance of a divine power. The earnest sincerity of some and the religious formulæ which they employ make it very difficult to disclose and deal with those who are charlatans and imposters. Probably no greater frauds, costing so much in money, in disappointed hopes and in aching hearts, have ever been practiced upon the American people than those offered in many plausible guises to the sick, the lame, the halt and the blind.

There is suffering in the world, and more and more Christian and scientific sanity are being applied. The need, however, is great. Hospitals, dispensaries and charities are merciful remedies; but Christian zeal and consecration are discovering and applying preventive measures.

Alliance with Charity and Philanthropy

It is well to remember that the social consciousness is a result of Christ's coming into the world. Where His gospel has not gone it does not exist.

In addition to her own direct ministrations in the field of charity and philanthropy, the American church is in intimate fellowship and cooperation with many societies and movements which seek the amelioration of the hard conditions under which a large part of the race lives and works. Charities and philanthropies of many forms, which spring up outside of the Church, receive continuing support from the Church by the contributions of sacrificial workers and of large sums of money, without which these organizations could not exist. If ever there has appeared hostility between these organization and the Church, it has been due to the fact that the Church, in some quarters, has been slow to understand the language and the methods of an applied Christianity as it departed somewhat from the older forms of Christian individualism. These misunderstandings have largely disappeared and cooperation in most instances has become intimate and cordial. If there were more of social justice in the world there would be less need for charitable and philanthropic measures.

The Church recognizes the American Red Cross as an arm of its own benevolence and ministry unto sufferers from disaster of any kind, and the Salvation Army as a branch of its service to the "down and outs," who may be shy of the more orderly methods of the Church itself.

The Church sets its approval upon and gives its support to a great multitude of homes, asylums, retreats, hospitals, reformatories and institutions for the relief of almost every misfortune which can befall mankind.

The Church believes in and promotes good music, and expressive architecture, and harmonious decoration. The Church fosters art in all of its forms, including painting, sculpture, landscape gardening and civic planning.

The Church encourages wholesome amusement and recreation and expresses in recent days an approval of all things normally human as a part of the divine harmony intended in that "Kingdom of God" when all things become Christ's.

Social Science

About thirty-five years ago, when the scholars of all the world began to recognize that there was a science of human society, the Church of America welcomed the new discipline into its colleges and into some of its theological seminaries, and began to tell her clergy that communities, and groups, and human institutions of every kind must be studied with scientific accuracy and care in an effort to discover, analyze and classify causes and forces so that the principles of Jesus Christ might be applied to the beginnings of difficulties and might intelligently encourage every form of good and check and repress every form of evil.

Now the colleges and universities of America have as a rule departments of sociology conducted by staffs of competent, and in many instances eminent, scholars who are studying, analyzing and interpreting social conditions and social forces, seeking to bring to bear from all sources of human knowledge data which will permit the formulation of some of the laws of social life and social conduct. Similar endeavors are being made in the institutions of other lands, and America is part of this world-wide fellowship of research, investigation and anticipated discovery.

Most of the theological seminaries of America have departments of instruction in social science in its applied forms, and candidates for the ministry are equipped at least with a sympathetic understanding of what most of the social problems are and are supplied with something of contact and ministry unto the communities of which their parishes may be a part.

Several denominations employ Social Service Secretaries, whose functions are to interpret to the churches the meaning of social service and to help these churches to become dynamic factors and forces in their communities for the improvement and betterment of every kind of social and moral condition. The number of denominations having such secretaries is increasing.

The American Church has produced not a few great leaders in this department of study and in the practice of this Christian social art. The books which they have produced have exerted a wide influence. To name but a few, and those who have passed into the Great Beyond, one needs to remember such as Washington Gladden, Josiah Strong and Walter Rauschenbusch. The living apostles of this order are a multitude.

The movement toward Christian unity, which has found expression particularly within the last twenty-five years in such organizations as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Home Missions Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, and the Council of Church Boards of Education, with allied bodies, has been a great factor, not simply in making plain a vast body of common interests belonging to all churches and to all Christians, but also in focussing attention and concentrating effort upon social and moral problems which fall to the Christian Church to solve and, by the processes of her Christian life, remove.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Family

- The Family and Social Work by Edward T. Devine, New York. Association Press. 1912.
The History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution, by Willystine Goodsell, New York, Macmillan Company, 1915.

Problems of Youth

- Spirit of Youth and the City Streets, by Jane Addams. New York. Macmillan Company, 1909.
The Delinquent Child in the Home, by Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott. New York. Charities Publication Committee, 1912.
Problems of Child Welfare, by George B. Mangold. New York. Macmillan Company, 1924.
Rural Child Welfare, by the National Child Labor Committee. New York. Macmillan Company, 1921.

Housing

- Housing Problems in America. Proceedings of the National Housing Association. New York.
Housing Betterment. Quarterly published by the National Housing Association.
Industrial Housing, by Morris Knowles. New York. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1920.
The battle of the Slum, by Jacob A. Riis. New York. Macmillan Co., 1902.
Industrial Housing Developments in America—1. Eclipse Park, Beloit, Wis., by Lawrence Veiller. No. 46. Published by the National Housing Association.
Industrial Housing Developments in America—2. Sawyer Park, Williamsport, Pa., by Lawrence Veiller. No. 47. Published by the National Housing Association.
Are Great Cities a Menace? The Garden City a Way Out, by Lawrence Veiller. No. 57. Published by the National Housing Association.

Defectives

- Care and Education of Crippled Children in the United States, by Edith Reeves. New York. Survey Associates, 1914.
Principles of Mental Hygiene, by William Alanson White. New York. Macmillan Company, 1917.
Feeble-Mindedness; Its Cause and Consequences, by Henry Herbert Goddard. New York. Macmillan Company, 1914.

Poverty

- Poverty, by Robert Hunter. New York. Macmillan Company, 1905.
Income in the United States, by the National Bureau of Economic Research. New York. Hartcourt Brace & Company, 1921.
Facing Old Age, a Study of Old Age Dependency in the United States and Old Age Pensions, by Abraham Epstein. New York. A. A. Knopf, 1922.

Race

- Christianity and the Race Problem, J. H. Oldham.
Up From Slavery, Booker T. Washington.
Clash of Color, Basil Matthews.
Of One Blood, Robt. E. Speer.
From Africa to America, W. D. Weatherford.
Race and Race Relationship, Robert F. Speer.

Temperance and Prohibition

- Why Prohibition? by Charles Stelzle. New York. George H. Doran Company, 1918.
Alcohol; Its Relation to Human Efficiency and Longevity, by Eugene Lyman Fisk, M.D.
Alcohol and the Human Body, by Sir Victor Horsely and Mary D. Sturge, M.D.
Alcohol; How It Affects the Individual, the Community and the Race, by Henry Smith Williams, M.D.

- Alcohol and the Human Race, by Richmond P. Hobson.
America and the World Liquor Problem, by Ernest H. Cherrington, LL.D., Litt.D.
Control of the Drink Trade; A Contribution to National Efficiency. Great Britain. Henry H. Carter.
Degenescence Sociale et Alcoolisme, French, by Dr. Legrain.
Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America. A Chronological History of the Temperance Reform, 1607-1919, by Ernest H. Cherrington, LL.D., Litt.D.
The Federal Government and the Liquor Traffic, by William E. Johnson.
Government Control of the Liquor Business in Great Britain and the United States, by Thomas Dixon Carver, Ph.D.
Handbook of Modern Facts About Alcohol, by Cora Frances Stoddard.
35,000 Miles of Prohibition, by C. M. and Gifford Gordon.
Prohibition Inside Out, by Roy A. Haynes, United States Prohibition Commissioner.
Grand Rapids (Mich.) Survey, New York.
The Survey for Nov. 6, 1920.

Prisoners and Crime

- The Individual Delinquent, by William Healy. Boston. Little, Brown & Co., 1915.
Punishment and Reformation. Revised edition, by F. H. Wines. New York. T. Y. Crowell Publishing Co., 1919.
Handbook for the Guidance of Committees Undertaking Personal Work for Prisoners in Local Jails. Commission on the Church and Social Service, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1924 (pamphlet).

Recreation

- The Church and the People at Play, by Henry A. Atkinson. Boston. Pilgrim Press, 1905.
Recreation and the Church, by Herbert W. Gates. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1917.
The Play Movement in the United States; a Student of Community Recreation, by C. E. Rainwater. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Health and Sanitation

- Faith and Health, by Charles Reynolds Brown. New York. T. Y. Crowell Co., 1924.
Sex Education, by Maurice A. Bigelow. New York. Macmillan Co., 1916.
Public Relief of Sickness, by Gerald Morgan. New York. Macmillan Company, 1922.
Public Health in the United States, by Harry Hascall Moore. New York. Harper & Bros., 1923.

Social Science

- Christianizing the Social Order, by Walter Rauschenbusch. New York. Macmillan Company, 1912.
Christianity and Social Science, by Charles A. Ellwood. New York. Macmillan Company, 1923.
Reconstruction of Religion, by Charles A. Ellwood. New York. Macmillan Company, 1922.
The New Social Order, by Harry F. Ward. New York. Macmillan Co., 1919.
A Social Theory of Religion Education, by George A. Coe. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.
The New State, by Mary P. Follett. New York. Longmans Green Co. 1918.
Studies in the Theory of Human Society, by Franklin H. Giddings. New York. Macmillan Company, 1922.
Social Discovery, by Edward C. Lindeman. New York. Republic Publishing Co., 1924.
Social Psychology, by Edward A. Ross. New York. Macmillan Company, 1908.
Introduction of Rural Sociology, by Paul L. Vogt. New York. D. Appleton & Co., 1922.
Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work. Published yearly by the Conference. University of Chicago Press.

Printed in U. S. A.
THE GOTHIC PRESS
New York, N. Y.

THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS



American Section
Report of Commission IV

to

THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

HELD IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

August 19 - 30, 1925

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

Commission Reports

- I. The Church's Obligation in View of
God's Purpose for the World.
- II. The Church and Economic and Industrial
Problems.
- III. The Church and Social and Moral Prob-
lems.
- IV. The Church and International Relations.
- V. The Church and Education.
- VI. Methods of Co-operative and Federative
Efforts By the Christian Communions.

GENERAL PREFACE

A few words should be written about the inception of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In the summer of 1919 the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches met at The Hague. This was the first meeting of an international character held after the signing of the Armistice, if one excepts a small gathering of labor leaders. About sixty leaders of the Churches were present, representing nearly all the Protestant Communions and most of the countries of Europe. Ten or twelve delegates were present from America.

The meetings at The Hague developed so sweet and reasonable an atmosphere, at a time when great bitterness prevailed everywhere, and the delegates present expressed themselves so strongly as to the un-Christian character of war and the necessity of establishing a world order on a new and Christian basis, that several of the delegates felt strongly that the time had come for the Churches officially to get together and say what these Churchmen semi-officially were saying. As a result Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of America, the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and others held an informal meeting to discuss the possibility of bringing the Churches of the world together for a Conference, where the Churches could utter their united conviction on international matters and all other matters with which society would have to deal in the reconstruction of civilization and the building of a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old, which lay all about them.

This preliminary meeting was not altogether spontaneous for on two separate occasions during the progress of the war, Archbishop Soederblom had communicated with the Churches of Europe and America regarding the possibility of such a conference and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America had suggested that a Conference of the Federated bodies of Churches in all the countries might meet together after the war. The unanimous opinion of the unofficial group at The Hague was that a committee should be appointed to bring the leaders of the Churches together with the aim of convincing them of the necessity of such a world gathering of the Churches, and asking them to take the matter up with their respective denominations. This committee went from The Hague to Paris and brought together as many of the leaders of the Churches as possible upon such short notice. This meeting became greatly interested in the project and requested Dr. Frederick Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenical Conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America to arrange for a preliminary meeting of the Churches the following summer.

Dr. Lynch proceeded from Paris to London and had several interviews with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F. B. Myers, Dr. Thomas Nightingale, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare and others. Meantime, Archbishop Soderbloom undertook to interest the Scandinavian Churches and Dr. Choisy

the Swiss Churches. Sufficient interest was aroused to warrant the calling of a preliminary Conference at Geneva in the summer of 1920.

As a result of the procedures recorded above, one hundred delegates assembled at Geneva in August of 1920. A three days session was held and the Conference gradually began to assume shape. Great interest was manifested and all present expressed themselves to the effect that the Church Universal had a great opportunity to exert a determining influence upon the new order that must follow the war. Furthermore the world was waiting for some great pronouncement from the Churches upon such questions as war and peace, the industrial order; such immediate problems as those having to do with intemperance and vice and upon all ethical and moral questions. It was felt that a positive and commanding utterance of the Churches in these trying years would do much to encourage a disheartened world and would make it much easier for those who were trying to reconstruct the world on a Christian basis to carry on this high task. There was much confusion in the world as to just where the Church did stand on these great problems disturbing the minds of men. The conviction was expressed that only as the rule of life laid down by the gospels became the law of nations could any hope for security and peace be found or the great sores of the world be healed.

Furthermore it was felt by all that whatever new international machinery might be set up or whatever new industrial order might arise, it was only as these were permeated by the spirit of Jesus Christ that they would fulfill the high hopes of their founders. It was also strongly felt that two great blessings might ensue from such a Conference. On the one hand all individual communions would profit by this period of common intercourse, especially those communions that had greatly suffered from the war. They would be made strong in the consciousness of the oneness of all Christ's disciples. On the other hand the coming together, if only for a month, of all the Churches of the world, to cooperate in the common task of redeeming the world order, and to make some great common pronouncement on the place of Christ in our civilization would be a great object lesson to the world.

At Geneva a large International Committee was set up which was divided into four groups, one for America, one for the British Empire, one for the European Protestant churches and the fourth representing the Orthodox Eastern Church. The International Committee appointed a smaller Executive Committee, which held three meetings in successive years, one at Peterborough, England, one at Zurich, Switzerland and one at Amsterdam, Holland. In August, 1922, the International Committee itself met at Helsingborg, Sweden, and was very fully attended by delegates from all the communions and nations. At this meeting the programme for the Conference assumed final shape. It was voted that the program for Stockholm should include the following groups of subjects:

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's purpose for the world.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The reports which followed are in fulfillment of this vote taken at Helsingborg. In April, 1924, the full Committee met again at Birmingham, England, in connection with C. O. P. E. C. and reviewed the progress made upon the reports and dealt specifically with plans for the Stockholm meeting.

This is in brief the history of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and is the explanation of the reports which follow. These reports have been prepared with great care by the leaders of the Churches and by experts in the several questions discussed. They are submitted to the Conference in the hope that the Conference will receive them in the same spirit in which they have been written, i.e. in the endeavor to find the common consciousness of the Churches upon these subjects and to voice its united feeling.

LIST OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Joint-Chairmen

- THE RT. REV. CHARLES H. BRENT, D.D., LL.D.
Bishop of Western New York, Vice-Chairman of Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- PRESIDENT W. H. P. FAUNCE, D.D., LL.D.
President of Brown University.

Secretaries

- REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.
Chairman of International Committee of World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
- REV. SIDNEY L. GULICK, D.D.
Secretary of Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Members

- ALEXANDER, MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP
Russian Orthodox Church.
- ALLEN, REV. WILLIAM C.
Member of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends and of College Park Association in California.
- CHAMBERLAIN, REV. WILLIAM I., Ph.D.
Foreign Secretary of Board of Foreign Missions of Reformed Church in America.
- CHAPPELL, REV. EDWIN B., D.D.
Sunday School Editor of Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
- CLARK, REV. FRANCIS E., D.D., LL.D.
President of United Society of Christian Endeavor.
- FINLEY, JOHN H., LL.D.
Editor of New York Times.
- HOLT, HAMILTON, LL.D.,
Executive Director of Woodrow Wilson Foundation.
- LYNCH, REV. FREDERICK, D.D.
Educational Secretary of The Church Peace Union and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
- MCDONALD, JAMES G.
Chairman of Executive Committee of Foreign Policy Association.
- MERRILL, REV. WILLIAM PIERSON, D.D.
Chairman of The Church Peace Union. Chairman of the American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
- PARSONS, RT. REV. EDWARD LAMBE, D.D.
Bishop co-adjutor of California.
- PLIMPTON, GEORGE A., LL.D.
Publisher. Treasurer of The Church Peace Union, and of World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
- RUSSELL, PROFESSOR ELBERT, Ph.D.
Director of Woolman School.
- SMITH, BOLTON
Business man and author.
- WINCHESTER, RT. REV. JAMES RIDOUT, D.D.
Bishop co-adjutor of Arkansas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword: General character of the problem and the task.

Part I.

	Page
1. A Strange Paradox	1
First Peace Society in U. S. in 1815. The "Peace Movement" in the U. S. sprang from the Church, but the churches as such had no part in it.	
Situation needs explanation.	
2. Two Conceptions of Religion	2
First—Individualistic and Eschatological.	
Second—Religion recognized in 19th Century as concerned also with this world and with social, international and inter-racial relations.	
3. Their Bearing on the Problems of War and Peace.....	3
Old conception meant indifference to questions of war and peace. New social emphasis brings sense of responsibility and demand for a Christian world-order.	
4. Awakening Consciousness in the Churches	3
Abolition of war recognized as one of aims of Church at the founding of Federal Council, 1905.	
Commission on International Justice and Goodwill.	
Denominational resolutions against War.	
5. Other Agencies	4
Church Peace Union founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1914.	
World Alliance for International Friendship.	
Promotion of friendly relations with Far East, Mexico, Latin America.	
City and State Federations of Churches beginning to take interest in international relations.	
6. The Churches and the League of Nations.....	5

Part II.

1. Relations of Church and State	7
In the United States the State and the Church are completely separate. Christians must obey the State in secular matters. But within limits of law and order churches and individuals are free to believe what they chose and live the life that they prefer. Churches may exert influence upon State.	
In the abolition of war, State alone is impotent, for it is at bottom a moral question. Church has a vital part to play.	
Question arises, is citizen subject to State in matters of morals, i.e., on such a matter as war?	

Part III.

Page

8

1. Fundamental Factors. What are the real causes of wars?.....
 - 1) Modern civilization makes all nations economically inter-dependent.
 - 2) Still each is independent politically.
 - 3) Growth of populations and the matter of food supply to be noted also.
 - 4) Secret diplomacy and secret treaties complicate the situation.
 - 5) Existence of nations and governments natural, inevitable.
 - 6) Ignorance of nations one of another an essential factor.
 - 7) Biased views of history taught in the schools of every country.
 - 8) Capitalistic organization of modern society needs study.
 - 9) Spirit of greed and selfishness contributes.
 - 10) Faulty profit distribution of modern industry to be noted.
 - 11) Partisan politics in many lands also to blame.
 - 12) Five additional factors.

Part IV.

1. A Stupendous Undertaking. Few as yet appreciate the size of the task of making a warless world.....

In each nation there should be a "Church Staff for Peace." Emotional demand for abolition of war almost universal. No nation wants war. Every nation wants rights. Must deal then with collisions of interest producing war. No few interested individuals or statesmen can do it. Thought of warless world must become a driving passion.

This means:

 - (a) An Engineering Task. To distribute accurate informations and organize international machinery.
 - (b) An Educational Task. To teach A.B.C. of international co-operation.
 - (c) A Co-operative Task. To devise ways of co-operation in trade, distribution of raw materials and maintenance of justice.
 - (d) A Religious Task. Conceptions of duty and religion must be enlarged to include international and inter-racial rights and duties.

This last task is the distinctive duty of the churches in a crusade for universal peace.

11

Part V.

1. Distinctive Function of the Churches

Pastors cannot take the place of statesmen in dealing with governments. Duty of pastor and preacher is:
To cultivate the spirit of fair play; not in the abstract.
To teach that Golden Rule must hold in international life.
To show that war system violates God's purposes for the international family.
To show true picture of war in the field of battle.
To lead Church members to oppose government action not in accord with Christian principles.
To inspire citizens to express their convictions regarding war issues.
To teach churches and leaflets to work together.
Churches must develop trained men for this task.

15

Some Conclusions	Page 16
1. The ideal of the Kingdom of God is universal. It includes every relation of human life.	
2. The achievement of a Christian world-order rests primarily on the churches of the nations.	
3. Individual Christians by the million should face their individual responsibilities as Christians.	
4. Christian leaders should cultivate in each nation the spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation.	
5. Christian nations should develop the right spirit and attitude toward the peoples of Asia and Africa.	
6. The churches should assert their loyalty to Christ as superior to every human loyalty.	
7. Never again should the churches yield their sacred influence in the support of wars dominated by secret policies and pagan principles and objectives.	
8. The central and final problem is the problem of Christian leadership	
Appendices	XIII

THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

FOREWORD

A Christian world-order must somehow be substituted for the pagan war-system of the nations. In the settlement of international disputes, some way must be found by which to have law and reason take the place of war.

This is the most stupendous and the most urgent task facing the modern world. The race is on between international education and the mutual destruction of the nations.

Man's mastery of Nature's titantic forces has far out-run his moral development. Moral fitness of millions of men to use these mighty forces, as individuals and as nations, must be promptly developed; otherwise our modern achievements in civilization will bring down upon us overwhelming disasters and age-long chaos.

The task is one that rests uniquely on the churches, for it is a moral task. How are the churches of the United States facing this task? Are they grappling with it vigorously and hopefully? What more should they be doing? And how?

These are the matters to be considered in this paper.

PART I

A Strange Paradox

The first peace society in the United States was organized in 1815. That was the beginning of a long succession of peace organizations, movements and leaders, an adequate account of which would require volumes. But, strange to say, the organized churches, as such, except for the Quakers (who, from their very first arrival in America have made remarkable and invaluable contributions to the cause of world peace) have had little interest and practically no part in the movement. Yet the vital breath of this movement came from the churches. Throughout the century, as indeed throughout the centuries since Christ, the Hebrew prophets and the New Testament have been the unfailing sources of inspiration and ideals. The leaders have been reared in the churches and trained in the Bible. But they have sought their ends through voluntary, non-church organizations. Until recent years, church members have not been taught that as Christians they have responsibility in the movement to abolish war.

This paradox needs explanation, for the antithesis of the Kingdom of God and the war-system of the nations is obvious. The position in which the churches of the whole world now find themselves is both anomalous and ominous. They are facing the most appalling problem and menace of present day civilization, yet they are apparently unconcerned. In their official conferences and assemblies ecclesiastical affairs claim their chief interest. Colossal preparation for "inevitable"

war threatens the world with bankruptcy and chaos; yet the churches seem ignorant of the issues and unconscious of their danger. Though possessing incalculable power, they are undisturbed by the challenge of Mars, and ignore their wonderful opportunity. How is this to be explained?

Two Conceptions of Religion

Throughout the Eighteenth Century and well on toward the close of the Nineteenth the vast majority of pastors and church members regarded religion as dealing with the welfare of men in the next world. The primary purpose of religion and of the Church was conceived to be that of providing salvation from eternal suffering in hell and assurance of permanent bliss in Heaven.

Religion was conceived eschatologically and individualistically. "What must I do to be saved?" was the dominant question. And the customary answer was: "Be baptized, join the church, believe the creeds, obey the ten commandments." The primary concern of religion was correct beliefs about and correct emotional attitudes toward God and Christ and the future life, correct relations with the church, correct rituals and ceremonials and a correct personal life in order to escape hell and secure entrance to heaven.

Literal acceptance of the Bible and especially of the apocalyptic passages of the New Testament was also stressed. The world, it was held, is to grow worse and worse until overwhelmed in destruction. Christ will then come in full power to create a new Heaven and a new earth. In this transformation and redemption of the world, the individual has no part or responsibility. It is all the work of God and His Christ, Christians have but to wait in patience and fidelity till He comes. They are in the "world" but not a part of it.

The Second Conception of Religion

Beginning, however, with the middle of the Nineteenth Century, a change began to take place in the conception of religion and the church, and in the interpretation of Christianity. Emphasis began to be placed on religion as having to do also with this world. The social value of religion began to be recognized. Study of the life and teachings of Jesus led many to feel that the real spirit and the real emphasis of His teachings are social and ethical, rather than metaphysical; that the meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, the significance of the parables and the whole drift of His life show that His conception of religion was deeply concerned with this world; that in His thought, God's judgment of men is concerned with their spirit of goodwill and brotherly helpfulness to each other; and that the real aim of Jesus was to establish a brotherhood which should transform society and beget a Kingdom of God on Earth as in Heaven.

Since the beginning of the present century these ideas have found

rapidly growing acceptance. The Christian religion, it is now increasingly held, seeks to know and practice God's will for this life. That will was revealed in Christ, and the reality of our salvation, both here and hereafter, consists in incarnating in our lives the spirit and ideals of Jesus. The church is becoming interested in effective processes for regenerating the spirit and reforming the minds of men, infusing them with the spirit and the mind of Jesus. It seeks to save men and women from debased personal character and debasing social, industrial and economic conditions. It is concerned also with the whole life of man—social, international and inter-racial. In a word, the Christian religion is increasingly conceived as the way of life and the kind of spirit taught and lived by Jesus.

Both these conceptions of religion and salvation are now prevalent among the Protestant churches of the United States. Many clearly distinguish between them, accepting one and rejecting the other. But the vast majority of Protestant Christians apparently hold both views in more or less mixture and confusion.

Their Bearing on the Problems of War and Peace

The bearing of the differing conceptions of religion on the attitude of Christians, and especially of the organized churches, toward the problems of war and peace is clear. In proportion as the individualistic, eschatological view is strongly held, church members take little interest in these matters and feel slight responsibility for abolishing war. In proportion as men believe that God's Kingdom is to come in this world by the service of those who practice the Christian way of life, interest and activity in the program develop.

The popular acceptance of the second view of religion was remarkably manifested at the beginning of the world war. Fierce condemnations were hurled at the Church because it had not prevented the great war. That war, it was assumed, could not have occurred had the Church done its duty. And this assumed in turn that the Church should teach and act on matters pertaining to this world; and that Christian salvation is not exclusively for individuals but also for society and for entire nations.

Awakening Consciousness in the Churches

The American churches love peace and hate war, but by reason of the fact that America is so far removed from Europe and its conflicts, there has developed only recently the strong consciousness on the part of the churches and religious leaders that war and the war system must be destroyed or Christianity will fail. The Quakers have throughout all their history put major emphasis upon this idea. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America was organized, the second conception of religion was sufficiently accepted to lead the Council, at its prelimi-

nary meeting in 1905, to the affirmation that among the objects of the Council was the abolition of war. A clarion call to the churches and a strong declaration on international relations was issued. Early in its history (1911) the Federal Council established the Commission on Peace and Arbitration, which was later renamed the Commission on International Justice and Goodwill.

Throughout the entire period of its activity, the Federal Council has issued to the churches, year after year, ringing messages for the enlargement of vision, for definiteness of action, and for deeds of mercy and goodwill. It has outlined important programs for international organization and cooperation and advocated the fundamental principles of a world guided by organized goodwill. It has published study courses for use in the churches. It has discussed concrete questions. It has sought by moral pressure to influence the policies of the Government on a number of occasions, of which perhaps the most notable was the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament. Even a partial record of its activities and utterances during the fifteen years of its existence would fill many volumes.

During these years, moreover, practically all of the annual gatherings of the larger denominations have passed resolutions dealing with questions of war and peace. They have begun to show some consciousness of their responsibility in the program for abolishing war. A vigorous demand for still more effective effort is arising on many sides. The problem is increasingly recognized as essentially moral.

Other Agencies

Early in 1914 this awakening consciousness found expression in the establishment of The Church Peace Union, a "Foundation" with a capital fund of \$2,000,000,—entrusted to a body of Trustees. This project had been proposed to Mr. Andrew Carnegie by leaders of the churches and peace movements in Great Britain and America. The income of the fund has been used for the promotion of educational activities among the churches of many countries, for assistance to local peace organizations of churches and for the cultivation of personal acquaintance and cooperation between individual Christian leaders of many lands.

The World Alliance for International Friendship through the churches, one of the principal products of The Church Peace Union, is continually bringing together groups of churchmen all over the United States to consider the establishment of an international order on the Christian principles. It has also held several great national conventions where it has dealt with the World Court and other allied topics. It publishes a monthly bulletin which is sent to its entire membership embracing several thousand pastors. During the past five years the Alliance has brought together leaders in the churches of all communions and practically all countries of Europe and North America for a yearly conference on what the churches may do to promote inter-

national goodwill. Such a conference was held at Copenhagen and was attended by some two hundred and fifty delegates, representing practically all Protestant communions as well as the Eastern Orthodox churches.

But more significant than organizational activities and contacts are those long sustained expressions of international goodwill that have been called forth among the churches of America by pitiful appeals for mercy and relief during and since the great war. These appeals have come from Belgium, the Near East, China, Russia, Austria, Japan, Germany. The value of the food, clothing, medicines and funds distributed by Americans in these countries during the past decade has been estimated at about a billion dollars.

For the promotion of better relations between the United States and the Far East, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has, for more than a decade, maintained, with the assistance of The Church Peace Union, a Commission on Relations with the Orient. It has rendered a significant service in seeking to promote mutual understanding, interpreting to Americans the problems of China, Korea and Japan and to those countries the problems and the situation in the United States. The task of reconciling the white and the yellow races is seen to be one of the urgently important and also one of the exceedingly difficult problems of the century.

Relations also with Mexico and Latin America are receiving serious attention from appropriate committees of the Federal Council. It is felt that in these concrete situations the churches should inform themselves of the facts, and particularly of the facts making for irritation and ill will, and should undertake procedures fitted to produce mutual understanding and good will.

In about fifty cities of the United States, Church Councils or Federations exist, many of which have established their own local Committees on International Goodwill.

The Churches and the League of Nations

"The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World," has for many decades been an ideal cherished and widely proclaimed by church leaders in the United States. During the Great War it was commonly expected that peace would bring an actual organization of the nations, making real and effective international law, with Courts and Commissions for the judicial and arbitral settlement of every threatening international dispute.

At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in December 1918, a Memorial to "The Peace Conference of the Allied and Associated Nations at Paris" was unanimously adopted. It urged the immediate formation of a "League of Nations." Among the paragraphs of that trenchant Memorial are the assertions that "We must have a governed world in which the security and rights of each shall rest upon the combined

strength of all. Humanity must be organized on a basis of justice and fair dealing. The law of brotherhood must supersede the law of the jungle." . . . The League "must be democratic in spirit and in form. It must be capable of continuous adjustment to the advancing life of separate nations and also of the world. It must be directed by the enlightened conscience of mankind." . . . Such a League will be "an international manifestation of the Kingdom of God."

This Memorial was conveyed to the Paris Peace Council by a special Commission from the Federal Council and may have been one of the influences that led to the organization of the League of Nations established by the Treaty of Versailles.

During the spring and summer of 1919, and especially during the Presidential campaign of 1920, the question of ratifying that treaty became a bitter political issue, upon which the political parties became hopelessly divided. It has not, therefore, seemed advisable for the Federal Council of the Churches to issue any statements for or against the League of Nations and American membership therein. This, however, does not signify the abandonment by the churches of their ideal of world cooperation in the establishment of justice, righteousness, security and peace for all alike. It only means that many within the churches have felt that certain injustices and wrongs were embodied in the Treaty of Versailles, which the League was to enforce, and that these injustices and wrongs, with other limitations and defects, made it impossible for them to see in the League a step toward the realization of their Christian ideals of the Kingdom of God for the international life of the world.

The establishment by the Nations, through the initiative of the League, of the Permanent Court of International Justice, whose functions are purely judicial and in the interest of equal justice for all, has received the practically unanimous support of the churches of the United States. They have expressed themselves with no uncertain voice in their remarkable Memorial to the Senate, (April, 1924), appealing for American adherence to that Court.

The Geneva Protocol on Compulsory Arbitration, Security and Disarmament has come before the country so recently that the churches have not yet had time to study it and decide their attitude toward its multitudinous provisions. They will, no doubt, approve unanimously its general principles for the complete outlawry of war, condemning as criminal an aggressor nation, and for the pacific settlement of every threatening international dispute. The point of doubt lies in the provisions for economic and military sanctions.

In general it may be said that the growing emphasis of the League on equal justice and security for all, and on ways for their achievement, together with diminishing emphasis on the work of the League for the primary benefit of the great Powers, is commending it to a steadily growing constituency in the United States. When it becomes clear to the vast majority in the churches that the League exists solely for

the promotion of justice, righteousness and peace for all, and cannot be utilized for special privilege by any, their demand for American membership in the League will be strong and insistent.

PART II

Relations of Church and State

In the program on a warless world the question necessarily arises regarding the respective responsibilities of the Church and the State. What are their proper relations to each other?

In the United States the respective organisms and functions of the State and the Church are ordinarily thought to be completely separate. A free Church in a free State is the accepted ideal. According to this view, the sacred and the secular are sharply distinguished. The Church has jurisdiction in the sacred matters of religion, while secular matters belong to the State. Christians must obey the State in secular matters, on the principle of rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; but in matters of religion the Church is supreme. The State should not interfere with the Church in its affairs, and neither should the Church interfere with the State in its affairs. The respective realms of control and jurisdiction are sharply separated.

Every individual is of necessity a member of the State and has inescapable and coercible obligations. He must obey the laws and support the Government. Membership, however, in the Church is voluntary. An individual is free to join and also free to withdraw at any time.

Both the State and the Church are regarded as legitimate and necessary institutions, each rendering an essential service to the welfare of the individual, of the community and of the nation.

Within the limits of law and order, churches and individuals of all religions are free to believe what they choose and free to live the kind of life they prefer. In this sense religion is an individual affair. Neither the State nor the Church may seek by force to coerce individual religious beliefs.

But, as already indicated, a rising tide of conviction is spreading over the nation, and especially among the churches, that the religion of Jesus requires a life of universal goodwill and brotherliness; that those who profess to be Christian should seek to banish evils of all kinds from the world; and that this can be done only by securing the acceptance of new ideals and a new spirit by the governments of the nations.

In this sense, the churches of America are beginning to seek to influence the policies of the State. The adoption of "Prohibition" is one manifestation of this conviction.

It is also becoming clear that in the achievement of a warless world the State alone is impotent. The assumptions widely held that religious and moral considerations are quite outside the purview of the State; that the State is an institution of power; that it is absolutely sov-

ereign; that it is under no obligation to a higher authority; and that the true aim and purpose of a State is to grow more and more powerful, we begin to recognize, constitute a menace to the world and even to the State in which these conceptions are held. The falsity of these assumptions must be asserted and taught. Behind and underneath the activities of the State, we began to see, there is need for effective moral education and leadership, cultivating among the people the ideals and motives of true international life upon which permanent peace can alone be based.

On the other hand, since the actual relations of nations are determined by their governments, the abolition of war can be achieved only by the appropriate agreements, activities and cooperation of states. Moral principles must control the activities of states if good will, mutual consideration and helpfulness are to prevail. Here then the realms of religion and politics intertwine.

We are learning that in this, and in many other matters as well, the sharp distinction between the secular and the religious, the political and the ethical cannot be maintained. This insight is forcing rapidly to the front questions regarding appropriate ways by which the Church can secure from the State the adoption of policies and practices that are ethical. On the answer of these questions hangs the fate of the world. For the wages of sin is death for nations as well as for individuals. A world of non-moral states is doomed.

And this raises the question whether a citizen is subject to the State in matters of morals. Can citizens who believe that war and preparations for war are violations of God's universal moral law be loyal to the State? Can a Christian be a loyal citizen of a non-moral State? Can a Christian in obedience to a command from the State rightly commit acts which would be wrong for him as an individual—theft, deception, anger, revenge, murder? Which possesses superior authority? How can the Church make the State Christian? Is the attitude of the "conscientious objector" right regarding the use of force by the State in achieving even the legitimate ends of security, liberty, justice and honor in international relations?

These are questions which demand earnest study. They involve profound issues in the mutual relations of Church and State. Manifestly their discussion is beyond the scope of this brief paper.

PART III

Fundamental Factors

Before asking ourselves how the churches of the world can render the service demanded of them in the abolition of war, brief consideration must be given to the real causes of war. The answer is not so simple as many suppose. Many factors are involved—economic, political, psychological. The following elements can be distinguished:

1) Modern civilization has made all the nations of the world extraordinarily interdependent. They are interdependent for raw materials. No nation is completely supplied from within its own territories with all the varieties of mineral and vegetable products absolutely essential for its manifold industrial activities. Each must secure something from without. They are also interdependent for markets. Purchases by one people furnish no small part of the prosperity of another people. And they are interdependent for food. No country supplies all the varieties and quantities of food demanded by its people. Each nation secures from others, and also contributes to others.

2) Notwithstanding their vital interdependence, each is absolutely independent politically. Each is a law unto itself. Each naturally seeks to extend its control of the vital necessities of its people. Each desires to be, just so far as possible, independent economically and industrially. Political independence is felt, indeed, to be menaced by economic dependence. This it is that has caused the rivalry during recent decades of the peoples of Europe for colonial possessions in Africa and for preferential trade rights and preferential access to raw materials and markets in China.

3) The growth of population in all civilized nations is another factor of immense significance. Victories of medical science have marvelously reduced the death rate and extended the span of life. The birth rate has not fallen correspondingly. When these vital changes affect all peoples, the problems of food production will grow increasingly serious. The amount of land on which food can be raised is strictly limited. The present food supply of the world can undoubtedly be much increased. But the time is not far ahead when the world's population will overtake its food supply. What effect will that have on the problem of war?

4) Secret diplomacy and secret treaties constitute another factor in the situation. Secrecy has been the habit of governments from ancient times. By these means, balances of power between groups of states have been created. Each state seeks its own economic or other advantage with the aid of the other states of the group, but it has no control of the policies and procedures of those states. The peoples moreover have been quite ignorant of the real facts and the mutual agreements and have been committed to programs that in the end inevitably involved war.

5) The existence of nations and of governments, however, is natural and indeed inevitable. States have come into being to meet certain fundamental needs of great groups of people living a common life. Not without sound reason have governments throughout the centuries claimed divine origin and divine authority. They exist to maintain order, justice and peace between the individuals, communities and classes of their own people. Intertribal developed into international relations. Each government naturally undertook to provide national security and liberty for its own people; to prevent oppression and ex-

ploitation by other nations; to maintain right and justice for its citizens in dealing with citizens of other lands; and to defend the honor and fair name of its people. These activities and objectives of government are natural, necessary and wholly legitimate. Yet these very activities have important bearings on the problem of war.

6) Ignorance of each other by enormous aggregations of men is still another important factor in the problem. Speaking different languages; controlled by different moral, religious and cultural practices; and conscious each of its own history, achievements, needs and interests, each group is apt to regard other groups as strangers and foreigners. The rights of others receive scant consideration. Each group ignores the Golden Rule. Wrongs produce wrath. Centuries of conflict have created deep-seated enmities, suspicions and more or less latent desires for revenge. A vicious circle of wrong spirit and mutual wrongdoings alienates all the peoples and races of men.

7) In the past, the systematic education provided in all primary and secondary schools has commonly given a biased view of the history and character of other peoples and races, thereby creating national bigotry, race prejudice and an attitude of mind susceptible to the war appeal; while the persistent glorification of war and war heroes in literature and text-books has perpetuated the idea that war is the field of supreme opportunity for ambitious youth. Even in the sphere of religion, there has often been a narrow nationalism, intensified by a type of teaching in which God has been presented as a tribal or national deity—rather than as the God and Father of all mankind.

8) The capitalistic organization of modern society as a cause of war needs special study. Many maintain that it is the principal cause today and that the war system will continue until private capital is destroyed. Great aggregations of private wealth seek investment in foreign lands. Capitalists have intimate relations with, if not virtual control of, governments. The resources of governments—diplomacy, army and navy—are utilized by big business to get opportunity and security for their foreign investments. Capital, moreover, in enormous munition plants, unconsciously produces and sometimes, it is asserted, even deliberately cultivates suspicion and fear between nations. For, in proportion as nations fear each other, they arm, and in proportion as nations arm, munition interests prosper.

9) The spirit of greed and selfishness, moreover, and the schemes of adventurous and unscrupulous traders in foreign lands to get all that is possible for as little as possible, are common characteristics of many who go from one group to another. The natural predatory tendencies of men and the spirit of exploitation by the shrewd and powerful of those that are ignorant, backward, and weak find abundant opportunity in the contacts of mutually alien races and strange peoples. These selfish transactions, wrongs and injustices lead to bitterness, resentment, animosity.

10) The very nature of our modern industrial system and its faulty method of distributing profits is also regarded by many as making war inevitable. This system, through its increasing utilization of scientific knowledge and natural power, can produce, with ever diminishing numbers of human workers, more than the local market can consume. This forces the dread alternatives of increasing unemployment or expanding foreign markets. To maintain employment, markets must therefore be secured by diplomacy and protected by naval and military forces. Economic militaristic imperialism, it is contended, is an inevitable by-product of our modern scientific-industrial-financial system. Vast world wars between nationalistic economic rivals appear to be inevitable so long as the present system is maintained.

11) Partisan politics in many lands seem also to play a particularly pernicious part in producing the war spirit and ultimately war. The party out of power charges the party in power with a "weak foreign policy." The spirit of narrow nationalism and jingoistic patriotism is cultivated and appealed to as a means by which to overthrow the dominant party and take its place. In the contests of political parties, the objective facts and the international consequences of their discussion are of little concern to the debaters. Each distorts the situation in order to put the other party in false positions and drive it out of power. Perhaps no more sinister and difficult element in the whole situation exists than the fierce and unscrupulous conflicts of party politics within each of the major nations.

12) Among other important factors in the situation we can barely refer to only five. Modern conditions of general education and communications have made possible as never before (1) a selfish, self-conscious, self-assertive nationalism and (2) a vast horde of imperfectly educated and irresponsible writers, who appeal to the worst nationalistic elements in each nation. Hence comes (3) the poisoned jingo press, which is at the same time too largely dominated (4) by great and self-seeking economic interests. In each land, moreover, are (5) thousands of retired officers of armies and navies, whose training makes them practically incapable of thinking on international relations save in terms of suspicion, ill-will and force. Their fervid patriotism leads them to oppose as disloyal and dangerous all plans for universal peace based on mutual confidence, goodwill, justice, law and order, in which ideals they too often have little or no faith. Their inevitable influence promotes public opinion in support of militarism and the force-philosophy of the State.

PART IV

A Supendous Undertaking

In the light of these various factors of the modern world, it is manifest that the achievement of a warless world is a task so intricate and so stupendous that few as yet appreciate how difficult and stupendous it is.

The various factors of modern civilization tending to produce war need the most careful study by church leaders and then by the rank and file of church members. Programs should be laid out for both knowing and dealing with the dangers. There is call for skilfull strategy in the crusade for peace. In each nation there might well be a "General Staff" of the Churches for Peace, composed of men of conspicuous ability, insight and knowledge. They should be trained specialists, giving their entire time to the single task of education and guiding the people of right mind and good will into those cooperative movements by which to overcome the "causes of war."

The emotional demand for the abolition of war is well-nigh universal. But an understanding of the real problems involved, and the willingness to pay the necessary price for achievement are still generally absent from the people.

No nation, indeed, wants war. But every nation wants its rights. It wants liberty and security. It wants respectful and honorable treatment. It wants the opportunity to enlarge its resources and its markets and to increase its prosperity. These objectives and these convictions tend to bring growing and vigorous nations into rivalry and conflict.

Fundamental, therefore, to the achievement of a warless world is the task of reconciling the nations. They must learn to see the real world of their neighbors, to understand and sympathize with their problems and needs. They must learn, also, to see their own national defects and wrong-doings in their international relations. They must develop mutual confidence. They must devise methods for solving in a fair and even-handed way the inevitable clashes of national desire and policy, before insoluble situations arise whose only result is war.

To see where real right and real justice lie is not always easy. Indeed it is highly difficult. In most disputes each party has some truth and some right on its side. If, therefore, war is to be banished from the modern world, the competing and clashing wants and needs and rights of vast self-conscious groups of men must somehow be reconciled.

To insure the ending of war we must deal with the collisions of interest which produce war; we must recognize in advance the causes of trouble and remove them while they are yet in germ. War cannot be stopped when it is about to break, when angry passions have gripped the nations. The time to act is years before, by changes in policy, by friendly conferences and mutually helpful agreements. When danger of war actually looms up it is usually too late.

A warless world, moreover, cannot be achieved by a small number of enthusiastic idealists and clever statesmen in a few of the nations. The reason why the "peace movement" has not thus far accomplished more than it has, is because the number of those who have taken serious interest in it has been so small. War will be banished from the world when millions of individuals participate in the movement. Men and women of every type and class, from laborers to statesmen, must share

in sane programs, develop the right spirit, understand the problems and cooperate in creating correct international public opinion.

The thought of a warless world must somehow be transformed form a beautiful idea into a driving passion. Mere intellectual considerations will never end war. A crusading spirit must take possession of scores of thousands of devoted and determined men and women in each land, who will inspire and lead the millions.

An Engineering Task

Yet mere emotional demand for the abolition of war, mere denunciation of war as folly, as futile, or even as sin; mere description of the glory and prosperity of a world in lasting peace, will not achieve the end. The task is a vast problem in human engineering. Condemnation never stopped the raging floods of the Mississippi from overflowing into adjacent lowlands. That was a task for engineers. So, too, is the task of ending wars an engineering task. Only it is vastly larger and more difficult. It requires the construction of much international machinery, for the distribution of impartial and adequate information, for developing the right spirit, for the creation of real international law, for maintaining the security of each by the united power of all, and for the actual peaceful settlement of international disputes.

An Educational Task

The abolition of war is a great educational undertaking. Millions of men in many lands must be taught to know history as it has actually been. The peoples must get the sober facts—deflating national pride and exaggerated egoism, creating respect for neighbors, and showing that all humanity is indissolubly bound together in a common destiny of weal or woe. Millions of men must be taught the A, B, C of international cooperation for the common good. And they must discover that the welfare, security, justice, liberty and honor of each is inseparable in the long run from that of all.

Systematic education for peace should begin in the primary schools. All history text-books need careful revision. Essential to our world-peace program are scientific and impartial accounts of national conflicts and international relations. The great cultural achievements and great leaders of each people should be described, for children—and adults also—love heroes. Even war heroes should be honored, but in ways that recognize the merits of heroes of other lands also, even of enemies. Thus may the spirit of fair play and appreciation be cultivated. The processes by which justice and peace, liberty and honor have been progressively secured within ever widening areas should be explained and stressed. The vital necessity for impartial law, courts and police should be made clear. For world peace can come only when great nations are ready to live as members of the world

community under a common law, abandoning their hitherto unquestioned right to be their own plaintiff, jury, judge and executioner in matters of international concern.

A Cooperative Task

Since wars spring from rivalry between nations, peace can come only by cooperation for peace in all matters that threaten to disrupt harmonious relations.

To be specific, methods for international cooperation should be devised in matters of trade, in the fair distribution of food and raw materials for industries and especially in the maintenance of security and justice for each by the united thought, purpose and power of all. This inevitably leads to some kind of a League or Association of Nations.

Might not the governments establish departments with suitable staffs and substantial budgets for the sole purpose of finding and promoting methods of international cooperation? Should not governments promote popular education on international good will? If it is legitimate for governments to maintain expensive establishments for security by means of armies and navies, why should it not be suitable for them to maintain parallel departments for security by means of activities creating good will and understanding between the nations? Efficiently carried out with budgets, small in proportion to budgets for military and naval preparedness, permanent peace for all the world could in time be assured. "Peace preparedness" would ultimately render "war-preparedness" unnecessary.*

A Moral and a Religious Task

Finally the establishment of permanent world peace is fundamentally also a moral and religious undertaking. Conceptions of duty and of religion must be enlarged. Whole nations must learn that moral principles effective in times of peace are universal and absolute and apply to states as well as to individuals. To steal, to lie, to deceive, to let loose the passions of lust and wrath and revenge, are never right. God is God for all and Father of all. He has no pet race. He has no private interest in one people more than in another. It is folly to petition him to be on "our side." If we are Christians, if we believe in the God whom Jesus trusted and obeyed, we must believe that God hates all injustice, all oppression, all selfishness, all greed, all deceit. God loves all men, all nations and all races.

This moral and religious education of the nations is the unique and

* The suggestion of this paragraph has been repeatedly advanced by American writers and speakers in various forms during recent years. The essay by Dr. David Starr Jordan contributed to the American Peace Award and published in the volume, "Ways to Peace," giving twenty of these essays, lays special stress on this proposal. In more concrete form it suggests that just as every government has a department devoted exclusively to the maintenance of security through preparations for war; and a department of foreign affairs for the negotiation of treaties and the constant scrutiny of all international relations from the standpoint of national policy; so there should be a department or bureau exclusively devoted to the promotion of international goodwill, justice and peace; the department might be made coordinate with the other departments of governments, or it might be made a section of the Department of State, the secretary in this case being under-secretary.

distinctive task for the churches in the Crusade for universal peace. If they fail, civilization fails and destruction will come down upon the whole world. Where the spirit of essential good will and of mutual confidence exists, every dispute can be settled. It is for the churches therefore to teach the peoples this right spirit. Without it no effective international machinery can either be established or made to function in times of stress and storm.

PART V

The Distinctive Function of the Churches

The churches cannot of course take the place of the states. Pastors cannot substitute for statesmen in the dealings of nations and governments. While statesmen must draft the treaties, conduct the conferences and determine the legal relations and procedures of the nations, the distinctive field for preachers and pastors is to cultivate among the people the spirit of fair play, the desire for right and truth, and the will to brotherhood. For, as has been repeatedly stated, at the very foundation of any effective peace movement are the inescapable principles of the Golden Rule and the Good Samaritan. These must be widely held as ruling convictions before they can be applied to international affairs.

These principles and this spirit, however, cannot be cultivated in the abstract, in a vacuum—as mere ideals. Pastors and preachers must know the concrete situations, the difficult questions of daily contacts. It is their high office to proclaim the law of God, the categorical imperative for nations as well as for individuals.

It is theirs to bridge the chasms of feeling created by international politics or trade. It is theirs to banish misunderstanding and to create right understanding. It is theirs to conquer the hatreds and banish the suspicions that lead to war; to still the passions of national selfishness and greed. It is theirs to lead their peoples into clear understanding of the causes of war and into fixed desire and determined will to walk as nations in the ways of righteousness and justice. It is theirs to teach the nations that practice of the Golden Rule in international life can alone bring in the Golden Age; that nations as well as individuals can and should overcome evil with good; that the strong should bear the burdens of the weak and so fulfil the law of Christ.

In a word, it is theirs to show how the world war-system of the nations violates God's purposes for the human family; that wrong and evil of every kind result from war and that fundamental and righteous solutions of difficulties between nations and races are seldom secured by war.

Christian leaders may well picture the pitiful sufferings of those who fight and die; the horrible shambles into which the boys are hurled; the still more pitiful plight of millions of innocent women and children and the essential futility of it all.

The churches can lead their members to unalterable opposition to every act of their own governments inconsistent with Christian ideals and Christian principles. They can become centers of accurate international knowledge, centers of courageous opposition to the war spirit and the war mind.

While the churches, therefore, should not seek to take the place of the State, nor pastors attempt to dictate to statesmen the details of policies or the terms of treaties, they can rightly demand of the State the observance of moral principles. The churches in every nation can properly request their statesmen to devise procedures, enact laws and adopt treaties that look to international cooperation for the common good in place of self-seeking, nationalistic ambitions, and that substitute law for war in the settlement of international disputes. The churches may properly lead in the advocacy of specific constructive propositions for international cooperation.

In democratic countries the churches can inspire their individual members to express in their votes their convictions regarding war and peace, electing men to positions of trust who will fight the moral battles for peace and guide their respective governments into Christian relations with other nations.

The Christian program for world peace must be sane and sober, practical and concrete. Crying for the moon, however insistent and enthusiastic, will always be futile and may be disastrous. The goals which the churches set before the people should be intrinsically achievable.

Finally the churches must learn to work together in this great crusade. Sporadic actions by one group and then another for this objective and then for that,—however good in themselves—will accomplish little. "Like a mighty army" is the clue and the watchword. Each church must be so much in earnest that it will devote money and men to the task. The church never accomplishes anything worth while in any line until it supports men and provides budgets for the cause.

The churches must develop trained men. They need experts. These will be their leaders. And these experts, representing the churches in each land, must get together and work together, steadily, patiently, determinedly, until they have fashioned and drilled a mighty host of Christian men and women who have the will to establish the Kingdom of God in the relations of nations.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. The ideal of the Kingdom of God is universal. It includes every relation of human life. Individuals, communities, society, classes, nations, races,—all come within its scope. And the great spiritual agency for realizing this ideal is the Church of the living God. To it has been entrusted the divine revelation of God's redemptive purposes for the human race, incarnated in His Son Jesus Christ, and renewed in vitalizing power, generation after generation, through the Holy Spirit.

This ideal of the Kingdom of God includes banishment of wrong and wickedness, sorrow, suffering, wretchedness and poverty and the achievement of righteousness and justice, mercy, joy and peace for all mankind.

2. The achievement of a Christian world-order rests primarily on the churches. This is a heavy responsibility. Failure spells the doom of Christian civilization, the destruction of the white nations in fratricidal strife. The churches of Christendom can end war if they will. To reach this goal they must be practical and concrete; and they must be inspired by holy and invincible enthusiasm. The war to end war must be a crusade—a crusade to banish pagan ideals, the pagan spirit and pagan policies. It must be guided by sanity, knowledge and practical common sense.

3. Christians by the million should be brought face to face with the personal question of the Christian attitude towards the war-system of the nations and the war-method of solving international and inter-racial disputes. Are they Christian? What is the method taught by Jesus for dealing with difficulties? In what spirit would Jesus seek to solve disputes? Each Christian must decide his own duty as a conscientious follower of Jesus.

4. Christian leaders in every land should set themselves with utmost zeal to cultivate among their own people the spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation with recent enemies and ancient foes. The hatreds and animosities due to past wrongs should be wiped out. Each people should learn to see its own wrong-doings. In this world of strife, none are innocent. All are guilty. All need both to forgive and to be forgiven. The reconciliation of the races is an essential factor in of Christian program for a warless world.

5. Christian nations must cultivate the right spirit and true friendliness toward the potentially mighty races of Asia and Africa. The achievement of a warless world depends on brotherly treatment accorded those races by the white nations of Europe.

6. The churches in each land should establish a committee or cabinet or General Staff for Peace. It should officially represent the entire Church body and be composed of the ablest leaders prepared to give adequate time to this vital ask. For none more vital or more imperative faces the churches and the world. This General Staff for Peace should scrutinize and judge the policies and actions of their respective governments from the standpoint of Christian ideals and principles. The government of each land should clearly understand that the churches are no longer bound to the chariot wheels of the State; that Christians have a loyalty to Christ that is superior to every human loyalty; and that as Christians and as churches they reserve to themselves the right to independent, moral judgment upon the international actions and policies of governments.

7. No more important and patriotic service can the churches render their respective nations and governments than by maintaining independence of judgment regarding international policies and undertakings. The governments should be cordially supported in every right endeavor and especially in resistance to the efforts of those who would utilize the military and diplomatic powers of governments for selfish, capitalistic or narrow nationalistic ambitions. Never again should the churches endorse and support a war concerning the causes, obligations and purposes of which they do not have complete information. Never again should they innocently and ignorantly yield themselves and their sacred authority to further the aims of governments dominated by secret, selfish policies and by pagan principles and objectives. The deceptions practiced by the governments during the late war in publishing "censored" information and in omitting from their official Blue Books and Yellow Books essential facts, thus securing a moral support from the people otherwise impossible, should be a lesson never to be forgotten.

8. Only when the churches persuade the nations to come to the House of God ready to listen to His Law and to walk in His paths, will come the dawn of a new day for the children of men. And it may be nearer than we think—if only a few determined, clear minded, inspired and gifted leaders shall arise in each church and each nation, called of God and endowed for this task. If the churches want them and call for them God will send them. The demand of the peoples of every land is for peace, universal and permanent. But the masses are dumb and blind. They do not see the way. They cannot speak their mind. They are groping for the goal. But they cannot reach it without intelligent, wise and conscientious leadership.

The central and final problem is the problem of Christian leaders.

APPENDICES

INTERNATIONAL IDEALS OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

Adopted by

The Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the
Churches of Christ in America, December, 1921
The majority of the Constituent Bodies of the
Federal Council during 1922, 1923 and 1924
The Fifth Quadrennial Meeting of the
Federal Council, December 1924

- I. We believe that nations no less than individuals are subject to God's immutable moral laws.
- II. We believe that nations achieve true welfare, greatness and honor only through just dealing and unselfish service.
- III. We believe that nations that regard themselves as Christian have special international obligations.
- IV. We believe that the spirit of Christian brotherliness can remove every unjust barrier of trade, color, creed and race.
- V. We believe that Christian patriotism demands the practice of good-will between nations.
- VI. We believe that international policies should secure equal justice for all races.
- VII. We believe that all nations should associate themselves permanently for world peace and good-will.
- VIII. We believe in international law, and in the universal use of international courts of justice and boards of arbitration.
- IX. We believe in a sweeping reduction of armaments by all nations.
- X. We believe in a warless world, and dedicate ourselves to its achievement.

**A MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA FROM
THE FEDERAL COUNCIL'S COMMISSION ON INTER-
NATIONAL JUSTICE AND GOODWILL**

(March, 1924)

The war-system of the nations is the outstanding evil of present-day civilization. It is the most ominous anti-Christian phase of modern life. The nations are constructing more and more effective devices for wholesale destruction. Should another world war overtake us, helpless men, women and children by the million, in cities great and small, would be suffocated, poisoned, burned to death.

* * * * *

The followers of Christ throughout our land should now concentrate on the stupendous and imperative task of outlawing war and banishing it from the world. The Churches, as Churches, should grapple with this monstrous foe. Let them denounce the colossal wrongs and evils of war, and point out the violation of every moral principle and ideal by the methods of war. Let them call the peoples to repentance for their long acquiescence in the war-system of the nations. Let them cultivate the right mind and the right will, which alone can make permanent peace a reality.

* * * * *

This is a task for the Churches of all the nations; for world peace can come only by the common action of all the nations. But the Churches of America have a unique opportunity and responsibility—to influence our nation to take the lead in outlawing war and to inspire our government to take its appropriate part in the councils of the nations for the establishment of a new international order.

* * * * *

Should not the Churches, affirming that their loyalty to Christ transcends all lower loyalties and determined to apply the principles and the spirit of Christ to every national and international problem, stand on their own feet, do their own thinking, adopt their own policies, and assert their independent right to deal with the greatest moral evil of this generation? Let them refuse unequivocally to support pagan international policies or acquiesce in colossal and provocative preparations for super-pagan wars. Let them declare that, for nations no less than for individuals, the wages of sin is death and that evil is to be overcome with good.

* * * * *

The time has surely come for the Churches, as Churches, local as well as national, to organize and mobilize for constructive programs in the crusade to establish world peace. Pastors should steadily hold these matters before their congregations. Women's organizations, young people's societies, Sunday Schools and groups of every kind should give themselves with utmost zeal to this crusade. All our Churches should become centers of accurate information on the bearing of Christian principles on international problems, centers of constructive programs for international righteousness and organized goodwill, centers of courageous antagonism to the war-spirit and the war-system, placing loyalty to Christ and His Will above local prejudice, class jealousy, race hatred, partisan politics and narrow nationalism.

This call is an appeal for practical action. Not they who say, "Lord, Lord" shall be saved, but they who DO the Will of the Heavenly Father.

* * * * *

Christian citizens have the right and the duty to inquire of those who represent them concerning their ideas and purposes regarding the outlawry of war, the substitution of law for war, and the embodiment in appropriate legislation of the ethical principles of the Kingdom of God in the relations of nations.

* * * * *

The war-system of the nations will be overthrown and a peace system established only when millions of men and women take vital interest in these questions, place them above party politics, and express their convictions in their votes.

THE 1925 PROGRAM OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

Adopted at Atlanta, Ga.

December 8, 1924

The Responsibility of the Churches

The Church of Jesus Christ throughout the world has the responsibility for moulding the minds and wills of nations, no less than of individuals, to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with God.

Christians of all lands and all churches should seek with utmost determination to reconcile the nations, to eradicate their misunderstandings, prejudices, hatreds, fears and suspicions, and to create among them the spirit of unity and the noble purpose to work for the common good.

Ideals and Realization

Realization of the ideals and principles of the Prince of Peace would mean the abolition of war and of all preparation for war. This would involve the acceptance of the spirit and the establishment of the agencies of justice, fair dealing and goodwill between nations. It would require the friendly cooperation of all nations in the creation and maintenance of international law, in the determination to settle every threatening international dispute by judicial process or by proceedings of arbitration or conciliation, and in provisions for security, honor and economic opportunity for all alike, both great and small. For permanent world peace can come only from justice, justice from impartial law and impartial law only from orderly society, organized on the principles of universal goodwill revealed to us in Jesus Christ.

For the achievement of these sublime ends, under the guidance and blessing of God Almighty, we commend to the Churches of America the following concrete suggestions:

The World Court

Let the Churches of America continue their campaign for adherence by the United States to the Protocol of the Permanent Court of International Justice, under the terms stated by the late President Harding and urged by President Coolidge.

This World Court of Justice is not only the fruition and consummation of many decades of American discussions, plans and desires for international peace through justice based on law, but also the promise of a larger and truer righteousness and justice among the nations, a step forward in the establishment of the Kingdom of God among men. This Court will, we believe, promote the development of a well-considered body of international law and the substitution of reason, justice and goodwill in place of the crude and savage methods of war or threats of war in settling international disputes and in maintaining legitimate and vital national interests.

International Law

Let the Christians of America steadily insist that the United States should actively cooperate with the nations of the world in codifying existing international law and in drafting and enacting new law to cover situations not covered by existing law. The United States should be among the first of the great nations on a reciprocal basis to accept the principles and the pledge to submit to suitable international tribunals for settlement every threatening dispute, whatsoever its nature may be.

The Outlawing of War

Let the Christians and Churches of America support with vigor the movement for the outlawing of war. America should heartily cooperate in the complete repudiation of aggressive war as a legitimate method for settling international disputes, remembering that where there is no aggression there will be no need for defense.

Aggressive war should be branded as an international crime and an aggressor nation regarded as having committed a crime among the nations. Adequate and impartial agencies should speedily be established for determining the aggressor in specific cases and for bringing to bear upon such a nation the combined moral condemnation of the world.

Universal Disarmament

Let American Christians support with united hearts and voices the call of all peoples for the drastic reduction of armaments of every kind.

Armaments not only cost colossal sums wrung from impoverished peoples, block industry, hinder production, consume capital, doom millions to helpless poverty, and cripple all movements for the common good; but they also foster international suspicion, fears and hatreds, in ever widening circles of vicious influence. They help create the militaristic mind among their own people and also among suspecting neighbors.

The time has come for nations to prepare and carry out together vast and continuing programs for reduction of armament, in conjunction with pledges for the pacific settlement of every threatening international dispute and with adequate guarantees of security and of maintenance of honor for the nations that give themselves to the program for peace.

For disarmament must be mutual; it is impossible without security and security depends upon adequate and enduring institutions and agencies for peace.

American Christians should exert every influence to secure the issuance or the acceptance by the United States Government of an invitation to attend a World Disarmament Conference. We believe that our own Government should show its readiness for such a step by taking the leadership in the program for disarmament.

Cooperation With Other Nations

Let us as Christian citizens earnestly advocate the full cooperation of the United States with other nations in efficient international organization for the pacific settlement of every international dispute, for the outlawing of war and for a program of thorough-going disarmament for all, in which organization all nations may take their full share in establishing world justice, in bearing world burdens and in maintaining world peace.

In accordance with expressions, official and otherwise, already made by the Constituent Bodies of the Federal Council, we advocate full, open and friendly relations between the United States and the League of Nations, without commitments which would involve us in the local politics of European or of other nations.

We believe that with proper reservations and a clear statement of America's principles and international policies the United States might and should take her place at the side of all the nations cooperating in the League and could render important service in solving difficult international problems and in promoting world justice and understanding, world goodwill and peace.

Reestablishing Right-Relations With Japan

Let American Christians study with utmost care the situation of strain recently created between America and Japan by the action of Congress in abruptly annulling the Gentlemen's Agreement with Japan and in refusing even to

consider Japan's courteous offer to adjust the matter on any terms within the bounds of reason and honor. Congress committed an act in flagrant disregard of the customary amenities and procedures of international relations.

Let us seek a fundamental solution of our relations with Japan which, while completely protecting the Pacific Coast States from all dangers of Asiatic immigration, shall be thoroughly courteous and free from humiliating race discrimination. The issue is not "closed." Some friendly adjustment must be found.

The Forward Move of the Churches

The Federal Council records its deep satisfaction in receiving the stirring declarations and utterances of many of its constituent bodies, calling for the establishment of a Christian world order and for the complete abolition of war as a recognized and legitimate method of settling disputes between nations.

It rejoices that for the achievement of these high ends fifteen denominations have established Commissions, Committees or Departments on International Goodwill to carry forward constructive educational programs within their own membership and to cooperate with one another in the common effort to render more effective the Christian ideal of a warless world.

Rejoicing in what has been done, the Federal Council expresses its conviction that, for the full achievement of our ideal, every national, state and city religious body should have an appropriate and effective agency to deal with this question, and in close cooperation with the Federal Council's Commission actually to carry out the essential educational programs. Denominations, pastors, congregations and church members should be urged to realize the weight of the responsibility resting upon them for the abolition of war and its complete banishment from the earth.

The Federal Council earnestly suggests to all colleges, theological schools and seminaries the importance of providing for their students effective courses on international questions and especially on the fundamental moral principles which must be generally accepted by nations before war and preparations for war will cease. It urges the introduction of lessons on these issues in Sunday Schools and in study groups and classes within or affiliated with the Churches.

The Need for Prayer

In seeking these high objectives of world justice, brotherhood and peace, the Federal Council calls upon all Christian people in every church and every home to pray as a people for forgiveness for our long apathy to the continuance of the war-system; forgiveness for our blindness to the utterly un-Christian character of war; forgiveness for our national selfishness, for our lack of love to enemies, for our self-satisfaction and self-righteousness, for our race-pride and arrogance.

Let us pray for fresh enlightenment of our minds, that we may see clearly where the pathway lies, for a new spirit of devotion to Jesus Christ, our Lord, for a new desire and a fixed will to do His will in our international relations. Let us educate our youth and our children to have faith in the possibility of achieving a Christian international life and of finding constructive methods for its realization.

The Summons to Self-Dedication

To these sublime purposes we summon the Christians and Churches of America, Let us seek to know and do the mind and the will of Christ, assured that these principles and ideals of His are rooted in the eternal and unchangeable character of God, the fountain of all justice and law, the infinite source of reason and love. Let us dedicate ourselves afresh to the accomplishment of these high ends, seeking therein the guidance and blessing of the Prince of Peace.

Excerpts from
DECLARATIONS and RESOLUTIONS
ADOPTED BY NATIONAL CHURCH BODIES

Methodist Episcopal (May, 1924)

Millions of our fellow men have died heroically in "a war to end war." What they undertook must be finished by methods of peace. War is not inevitable. It is the supreme enemy of mankind. Its futility is beyond question. Its continuance is the suicide of civilization. We are determined to outlaw the whole war system.

The patriotism of the Methodist Episcopal Church has never been challenged. Neither our motives nor our loyalty must be impugned when we insist on the fulfillment of pledges made to the dead and assert our Christian ideals for the living. Governments which ignore the Christian conscience of men in time of peace can not justly claim the lives of men in time of war. Secret diplomacy and political partisanship must not draw men into the dilemma of deciding between support of country and loyalty to Christ.

The world is now open to a crusade for peace. War-weary nations everywhere are eagerly waiting. America should lead the way. The Nation and the Church can do now what they may never, never be able to do again.

We set ourselves to create the will to peace. We recommend that a prayer for peace be prepared and used at every communion service. Through its educational program, our Church must do its full share to mould the present youth of all races into a peace-loving generation. We shall launch an aggressive campaign to teach the nature, causes and consequences of war. The glorification of war must end.

We set ourselves to create the conditions for peace. Selfish nationalism, economic imperialism and militarism must cease. We demand the establishment of the principle that conscription of wealth and labor must be the counterpart of any future conscription of human life. As great odium must be put upon the war profiteer as is put upon the slacker. The protection of special privileges secured by investors in foreign lands has too often imperiled the peace of nations. This source of danger must be prevented. The rights of the smallest nation must be held as sacred as those of the strongest.

We hold the cause of peace dearer than party allegiance and we shall tolerate no dilatory or evasive attitudes on the part of those who represent us.

We set ourselves to create organization for peace. Grateful to our Government for leadership in the movement toward reduction of armaments and the promotion of tribunals for international arbitration, we insist upon a still more decided and aggressive policy in these directions. We urge the President of the United States to summon another Conference of the Nations for the more drastic reduction of armaments. We likewise urge upon the Senate the immediate entrance of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice. The participation of the United States in a League of Nations will receive our active aid.

We call upon all our people to support for public office men pledged to secure these ends. The ballot and other direct processes of democracy must now be employed in securing a warless world.

World Christianity is enlisting in the campaign for peace. We seek alliance with all the forces which make for the principles here advocated. We, therefore, propose that our Church now assume its full share of responsibility by appointing at this General Conference a commission of twenty-five members, composed of five bishops, ten ministers, and ten laymen authorized and instructed to invite the religious forces of the world to unite in a conference to consider the best plans and methods for making the impact of a world-wide religious sentiment against the evils we deplore.

The principles of brotherhood are plainly challenged. The progress of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ is clearly at stake. The issues are so momentous, the opportunity for leadership is so great, that we here and now call upon all people to avoid divisive and fruitless discussions and unite their energies in this great movement for a war-free world. To this sublime end we dedicate ourselves, and for its accomplishment we invoke the blessing of Almighty God.

Baptist (North) (June, 1924)

Whereas, the Christian conscience of the world is coming to recognize that war is neither inevitable nor necessary, that it is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ; that it is the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts humanity today; that under modern conditions war has now become not only futile but suicidal; and that the recognition of this fact is necessary to the continuance of civilization; therefore be it

Resolved, that the Northern Baptist Convention again declares its conviction that war is a wrong method for settling international disputes, and that, because it is wrong, the church must not only condemn war, and the things that make for war, but also take an active part in discovering and promoting the things which make for peace; and be it further

Resolved, that the Northern Baptist Convention desires to join with other religious bodies in calling a world conference to consider what can be done to promote more friendly relations among nations and to create a world conscience against war and so to bring the power of a United Christendom to bear against the continuance of the war system; and be it further

Resolved, that we request our pastors and people to set themselves afresh to the task of creating a love of justice and a will for peace, and thus achieve the utter repudiation of war by the Christian conscience and its outlawry by the governments of the world.

Protestant Episcopal (September, 1922)

There is one way and one way only to outlaw war. We must first establish a peace system. Mere disarmament by itself will not stop war. Only the firm establishment of the institutions and agencies of justice and of liberty under law, maintained by effective sanctions at the hands of law-abiding and peace loving nations, can possibly banish war from this war-cursed world. The most urgent need of mankind is the speedy establishment of international institutions to assure equal justice, full security and fair economic opportunity for all nations alike. These are essential pre-requisites to permanent peace.

* * * * *

We solemnly commit ourselves as members of a Christian Church to use every consistent means to the end that war may be abolished and that the Golden Rule may become the universal law of nations and peoples.

(November, 1923)

The Church cannot permit war to remain the only method for the ultimate settlement of disputes between nations. We are therefore of the conviction that it is the immediate and imperative duty of the United States Government either to join the existing League of Nations, or to proceed immediately to organize some other effective Association or Council of Nations for the purpose of settling amicably international disputes, and thus save us from the great danger of another World War.

Congregational (October, 1923)

Believing that war as a method of settling international disputes or achieving national aspirations is both unnecessary and anti-Christian, the Council reaffirms its faith that Christ's way of thought and life is sufficient to overcome the causes of war, and lead the nations into a life of co-operative peace. The Council also believes that there is a special obligation upon the Church of Christ to organize and prepare for peace, to engage at once with all its power in a campaign of education against war as a method and in favor of other methods of settling disputes, to diminish among peoples the disposition to resort to force, to bring the people to the conviction that war is wrong, and to develop the will for peace.

* * * * *

The Council recommends to the churches that there be systematically and concretely presented, from the pulpit, in the church schools, and in special study classes, ideals and methods of international goodwill and co-operation.

... It is the sense of the National Council of Congregational Churches that our Nation should rise above all political partisanship in its international relations; and that the world situation demands that America proceed at once to enter the World Court. . . .

We believe that the United States should either enter into the existing League of Nations, or find some more effective way to take our part in bearing the burdens of the world, solving its desperate problems and promoting peace among men.

Presbyterian (U. S. A.) (June, 1924)

The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. pledges all its energies to the outlawing of war and to the hastening of the day when nations shall learn war no more. We refuse to believe that the wholesale slaughter of human beings upon the battlefield is morally any more necessary to man's highest development than is killing individuals. We see in war's cruelties, made more terrible by modern invention, not only a menace to civilization but also a definite challenge to the followers of the Prince of Peace.

We invite the co-operation of all Christendom in a determined effort to devise such complete machinery for peace as shall insure the settlement of all international controversies by reason instead of force.

To this end we favor participation by our nation with other nations in the Court of International Justice, and the submission for judicial settlement, or the arbitration, of disputes, and the investigation, before a resort to arms, of all differences which cannot be adjudicated or arbitrated, reserving the right to control our own destiny and to determine whether or not and when we shall declare war.

Reformed Presbyterian Church (June, 1924)

Whereas war is essentially and inherently a supreme violation of the teachings and spirit of Jesus; and whereas it is ineffective as a means for building the Kingdom of God and is in its very nature self-defeating; and, whereas it has been amply demonstrated that preparedness for war is no guarantee for national security; and, whereas war as a method for securing national ends, however just and right, is anti-Christian; be it resolved:

I. That the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Synod assembled requests the government of the United States to take immediate steps toward the outlawing of war as a legal and justifiable method of settling international disputes.

II. That this Synod insist on the substitution of law and the processess of law for violence in the settlement of such disputes, and to that end, that the Senate and Cabinet be urged to take the steps necessary to make this country a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice and of the League of Nations.

United Presbyterian (June, 1924)

While we positively disown sympathy with any effort of anti-war propagandists which tends to encourage or promote disloyalty or dim the lustre of national spirit and patriotism, we nevertheless, as a Church, declare our opposition to war and refuse to bless, condone, or support it in any way except it be in justifiable self-defense or as a clear necessity for the deliverance of an oppressed people or nation.

We believe that universal and permanent peace is possible only by the Prince of Peace that the regeneration of the hearts of men through the gospel of Jesus Christ is the final solution of the problem of war.

Methodist Protestant Church (May, 1924)

"We hold it to be a national sin to resort to war until every possible peaceful agency has been employed; and that no nation is ever justified in a war of aggression.

* * * * *

We favor participation by our nation with other nations in the Court of International Justice, and the submission for judicial settlement of all disputes; and the investigation before resort to arms of all differences which cannot be adjudi-

cated or arbitrated, reserving unto ourselves the right to determine whether or not, and when we shall declare war. We pledge all our energies to the outlawing of war, and to the hastening of the day when the slaughter of human beings upon the battlefield is forever ended.

Friends' General Conference (July, 1924)

We believe the whole system of determining right by violence and destruction rather than by friendly conference and negotiations is fundamentally wrong, inefficient and irreligious. We oppose as a religious body all participation in war, and believe that no more patriotic service in any nation can be rendered than to save that nation and others from war. We urge all people to support such international organizations as will insure peaceful methods of dealing with differences between nations.

Unitarian (South) (April 29, 1924)

Resolved that we renew our allegiance to the things which make for peace, and by teaching and example, in our worship and our daily conduct, dedicate ourselves to the principles of our religion, so that barriers may be broken down among the nations, mutual understanding be increased, the unity of our common humanity deepened, and the governments of the world inspired to advance our civilization by the spiritual forces of truth, integrity and service.

Unitarian (North) (May, 1924)

Now, therefore, we urge all of our churches and their members to use their influence toward the development of more civilized and friendly international relations whereby all world problems may be solved by peaceful means and to the end that warfare may be abolished from the earth.

Universalist General Convention (October, 1923)

Whereas, war is a denial of the basic principles of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man and is the cause of terrific destruction of both material and spiritual values and has reached such a stage of development that it threatens the existence of civilization.

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that this Convention place itself unequivocally on the side of every effort towards causing war to be recognized as a crime in international law and a violation of the Christian religion.

Central Conference of American Rabbis (June, 1924)

We urge upon our fellow-citizens and upon those who guide the destinies of our land that, being true to themselves, they adopt an uncompromising opposition to war. We believe that war is morally indefensible. War that crushes the young, that brutalizes and degrades, that destroys all that is most precious, must not be honored and glorified. It must be recognized for what it is and this must be taught to our children. . . .

We do not champion extreme attitudes. We do not adhere to the doctrine of non-resistance. We believe that there have been righteous wars. Freedom and justice are worth more than life. A nation must defend its moral integrity, its existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. The Christian's Attitude Toward War

- "What Makes a Nation Great?" (120 pp.), Frederick Lynch, 1914.
- "Christ or Napoleon" (96 pp.), Peter Ainslie, 1915.
- "Christ or Mars?" (1923). Will Irwin.
- "The Higher Patriotism" (72 pp.), John Grier Hibben, 1915.
- "Is Christianity Practicable?" (240 pp.), Wm. Adams Brown, 1916.
- "The World and the Gospel" (222 pp.), J. H. Oldham, 1916.
- "What the War Is Teaching" (218 pp.), Chas. E. Jefferson, 1916.
- "The Challenge of the Present Crisis" (99 pp.), Harry Emerson Fosdick, 1917.
- "The Christian Man, the Church and the War" (105 pp.), Robert E. Speer, 1918.
- "Religion and War" (188 pp.), W. H. P. Faunce, 1918.
- "The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War" (330 pp.), Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, 1920.
- "Christ and International Life" (150 pp.), Edith Picton-Turbervill, 1922.
- "The Sword or the Cross" (61 pp.), Kirby Page, 1922.
- "The Christian Basis of World Democracy" (1919), K. S. Latourette.
- "War: Its Causes, Consequences and Cure" (1923), Kirby Page.
- The Christian Basis of World Democracy (1919): K. S. Latourette.

B. Valuable Compilations and Quotations

- "Selected Quotations on Peace and War" (540 pp.), Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1915.
- "The War and Religion". A very complete catalogue of books, pamphlets and articles. Association Press (135 pp. 1919).
- "Ways to Peace" 1924, Twenty Selected Plans, and Preface by Edward W. Bok
- "Mobilizing for Peace" (1924), Addresses delivered at the Annual Meeting of the World Alliance for International Friendship, edited by Frederick Lynch.
- "America's Stake in the Far East" (165 pp.), Chas. H. Fahs, 1920.
- "America's Stake in Europe" (186 pp.), Chas. H. Fahs, 1921.
- "Handbook on Disarmament" (320 pp.), Mary K. Reiley, 1921.

C. The Causes, the Results and the Cure of War

- "The Great Illusion" (416 pp.), Norman Angell, 1913.
- "The War of Steel and Gold" (320 pp.), H. N. Brailsford, 1914.
- "The Stakes of Diplomacy" (235 pp.), Walter Lippman, 1915.
- "Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory" (415 pp.), Geo. W. Nasmyth, 1916.
- "A Straight Deal or an Ancient Grudge" (287 pp.), Owen Wister, 1920.
- "Causes of International War" (110 pp.), G. Lowes Dickinson, 1920.
- "Direct and Indirect Costs of the War" (250 pp.), E. L. Bogart, 1920.
- "Now It Can Be Told" (400 pp.), Sir Philip Gibbs, 1920.
- "War: Its Nature, Cause and Cure" (1923), G. Lowes Dickinson.
- "The A. B. C. of Disarmament" (122 pp.), Arthur Bullard, 1921.
- "The Folly of Nations" (405 pp.), Frederick Palmer, 1921.
- "The Fruits of Victory" (335 pp.), Norman Angell, 1921.
- "The Next War" (161 pp.), Will Irwin, 1921.
- "The Staggering Burden of Armament" (60 pp.), World Peace Foundation, 1921.
- "International Relations" (260 pp.), James Bryce, 1921.
- "Cross Currents in Europe Today" (250 pp.), Chas. A. Beard, 1922.
- "Introduction to the Study of International Organization" (647 pp.) P. P. Potter, 1922.
- "Public Opinion" (427 pp.) Walter Lippman, 1922.
- "The Prevention of War" (1923), Philip Kerr and Lionel Curtis.
- "War on War" (1923), Frederick J. Libby.

D. On International Co-operation

- "The Road to World Peace" (370 pp.), Oscar Newfang, 1924.
"Essay on a Congress of Nations (1840)" (161 pp.), Wm. Ladd, reprinted with an introduction by Dr. James Brown Scott, 1916.
"The Federation of the World" (228 pp.), Benjamin F. Trueblood, 1899.
"The Two Hague Conferences" (516 pp.), Prof. Wm. I. Hull, 1908.
"Towards International Government" (212 pp.), J. A. Hobson, 1915.
"The Great Solution" (169 pp.), Henri LaFontaine, 1916.
"International Government" (410 pp.), L. S. Woolf, 1916.
"A League of Nations," 2 Vols. (137 pp. and 140 pp.), Theodore Marburg, 1917 and 1918.
"The League of Nations at Work" (215 pp.), Arthur Sweetser, 1920.
"Entente Diplomacy and the World" (762 pp.), Siebert & Schreiner, 1921.
"League of Nations Year Book" (440 pp.), Chas. H. Levermore, 1922.
"The History and Nature of International Relations" (299 pp.), E. A. Walsh, 1922.
"League or War" (1923), Irving Fisher.
"Introduction to World Politics" (1922), Herbert Adams Gibbons.

E. Far Eastern Problems

The Far East as a Whole

- "The Occident and the Orient" (214 pp.), Sir Valentine Chirol, 1924.
"The New Map of Asia" (525 pp.), H. A. Gibbons, 1921.
"China, Japan and Korea" (325 pp.), J. O. P. Bland, 1921.
"Problems of the Pacific and the Far East" (20 pp.), Sidney L. Gulick, 1922.
"The Rising Temper of the East" (247 pp.), Frazier Hunt, 1922.
"Russia in the Far East" (181 pp.), L. Pasvolosky, 1922.
"Asia at the Crossroads" (369 pp.), E. Alexander Powell, 1922.

China

- "The Development of China" (290 pp.), K. S. Latourette, 1917.
"Foreign Financial Control in China" (295 pp.), T. W. Overlack, 1919.
"Foreign Rights and Interests in China" (594 pp.), Prof. W. W. Willoughby, 1920.
"China, Captive or Free" (310 pp.), Gilbert Reid, 1921.
"China's Place in the Sun" (212 pp.), Stanley High, 1922.

Japan

- "The Development of Japan" (225 pp.), K. S. Latourette, 1918.
"Japan and World Peace" (196 pp.), K. K. Kawakami, 1919.
"Must We Fight Japan?" (536 pp.), W. B. Pitkin, 1921.
"What Japan Thinks" (237 pp.), K. K. Kawakami, 1921.
"What Japan Wants" (154 pp.), Y. S. Kuno, 1921.
"What Shall I Think of Japan?" (285 pp.), George Gleason, 1921.
"Japanese-American Relations" (207 pp.), Hon. Iichiro Tokutomi, 1922.

Korea

- "The Mastery of the Far East (Japan and Korea)" (670 pp.), 3, Arthur J. Brown, 1919.
"The Oriental Policy of the United States" (306 pp.), Henry Chung, 1919.
"The Rebirth of Korea" (272 pp.), Hugh H. Cynn, 1920.
"The Case of Korea" (365 pp.), Henry Chung, 1921.

The California Japanese Question

- "California and the Japanese" (231 pp.), California State Board of Control, 1920.
"Immigration (Japanese)" (232 pp.), *Annals, American Academy of Social and Political Science*, Jan., 1921.
"The American Japanese Problem" (339 pp.), Sidney L. Gulick, 1914.
"American Democracy and Asiatic Citizenship" (257 pp.), Sidney L. Gulick, 1918.
"Japan and the California Question" (250 pp.), T. Iyenaga, 1921.
"The Real Japanese Question" (269.), K. K. Kawakami, 1921.
"Should Congress Enact Special Laws Affecting Japanese?" (96 pp.), Sidney L. Gulick, 1922.

The Washington Conference and the Far East.

- "Japan and the Far East Washington Conference" (95 pp.) Henry W. Taft, 1921.
"China at the Conference" (419 pp.), W. W. Willoughby, 1922.
"Chinese-Japanese Conversations at Washington on the Shantung Question" (396 pp.), *Official Minutes*, 1922.
"Japan's Pacific Policy" (373 pp.), K. K. Kawakami, 1922.

Printed in U. S. A.
THE GOTHIC PRESS
New York, N. Y.

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION



American Section
Report of Commission V
to
THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK
HELD IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN
August 19-30, 1925

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

Commission Reports

- I. The Church's Obligation in View of
God's Purpose for the World.
- II. The Church and Economic and Industrial
Problems.
- III. The Church and Social and Moral Prob-
lems.
- IV. The Church and International Relations.
- V. The Church and Education.
- VI. Methods of Co-operative and Federative
Efforts By the Christian Communions.

GENERAL PREFACE

A few words should be written about the inception of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In the summer of 1919 the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches met at The Hague. This was the first meeting of an international character held after the signing of the Armistice, if one excepts a small gathering of labor leaders. About sixty leaders of the Churches were present, representing nearly all the Protestant Communion and most of the countries of Europe. Ten or twelve delegates were present from America.

The meetings at The Hague developed so sweet and reasonable an atmosphere, at a time when great bitterness prevailed everywhere, and the delegates present expressed themselves so strongly as to the un-Christian character of war and the necessity of establishing a world order on a new and Christian basis, that several of the delegates felt strongly that the time had come for the Churches officially to get together and say what these Churchmen semi-officially were saying. As a result Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of America, the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and others held an informal meeting to discuss the possibility of bringing the Churches of the world together for a Conference, where the Churches could utter their united conviction on international matters and all other matters with which society would have to deal in the reconstruction of civilization and the building of a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old, which lay all about them.

This preliminary meeting was not altogether spontaneous for on two separate occasions during the progress of the war, Archbishop Soederblom had communicated with the Churches of Europe and America regarding the possibility of such a conference and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America had suggested that a Conference of the Federated bodies of Churches in all the countries might meet together after the war. The unanimous opinion of the unofficial group at The Hague was that a committee should be appointed to bring the leaders of the Churches together with the aim of convincing them of the necessity of such a world gathering of the Churches, and asking them to take the matter up with their respective denominations. This committee went from The Hague to Paris and brought together as many of the leaders of the Churches as possible upon such short notice. This meeting became greatly interested in the project and requested Dr. Frederick Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenical Conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America to arrange for a preliminary meeting of the Churches the following summer.

Dr. Lynch proceeded from Paris to London and had several interviews with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F. B. Myers, Dr. Thomas Nightingale, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare and others. Meantime, Archbishop Soderbloom undertook to interest the Scandinavian Churches and Dr. Choisy

the Swiss Churches. Sufficient interest was aroused to warrant the calling of a preliminary Conference at Geneva in the summer of 1920.

As a result of the procedures recorded above, one hundred delegates assembled at Geneva in August of 1920. A three days session was held and the Conference gradually began to assume shape. Great interest was manifested and all present expressed themselves to the effect that the Church Universal had a great opportunity to exert a determining influence upon the new order that must follow the war. Furthermore the world was waiting for some great pronouncement from the Churches upon such questions as war and peace, the industrial order; such immediate problems as those having to do with intemperance and vice and upon all ethical and moral questions. It was felt that a positive and commanding utterance of the Churches in these trying years would do much to encourage a disheartened world and would make it much easier for those who were trying to reconstruct the world on a Christian basis to carry on this high task. There was much confusion in the world as to just where the Church did stand on these great problems disturbing the minds of men. The conviction was expressed that only as the rule of life laid down by the gospels became the law of nations could any hope for security and peace be found or the great sores of the world be healed.

Furthermore it was felt by all that whatever new international machinery might be set up or whatever new industrial order might arise, it was only as these were permeated by the spirit of Jesus Christ that they would fulfill the high hopes of their founders. It was also strongly felt that two great blessings might ensue from such a Conference. On the one hand all individual communions would profit by this period of common intercourse, especially those communions that had greatly suffered from the war. They would be made strong in the consciousness of the oneness of all Christ's disciples. On the other hand the coming together, if only for a month, of all the Churches of the world, to cooperate in the common task of redeeming the world order, and to make some great common pronouncement on the place of Christ in our civilization would be a great object lesson to the world.

At Geneva a large International Committee was set up which was divided into four groups, one for America, one for the British Empire, one for the European Protestant churches and the fourth representing the Orthodox Eastern Church. The International Committee appointed a smaller Executive Committee, which held three meetings in successive years, one at Peterborough, England, one at Zurich, Switzerland and one at Amsterdam, Holland. In August, 1922, the International Committee itself met at Helsingborg, Sweden, and was very fully attended by delegates from all the communions and nations. At this meeting the programme for the Conference assumed final shape. It was voted that the program for Stockholm should include the following groups of subjects:

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's purpose for the world.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The reports which followed are in fulfillment of this vote taken at Helsingborg. In April, 1924, the full Committee met again at Birmingham, England, in connection with C. O. P. E. C. and reviewed the progress made upon the reports and dealt specifically with plans for the Stockholm meeting.

This is in brief the history of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and is the explanation of the reports which follow. These reports have been prepared with great care by the leaders of the Churches and by experts in the several questions discussed. They are submitted to the Conference in the hope that the Conference will receive them in the same spirit in which they have been written, i.e. in the endeavor to find the common consciousness of the Churches upon these subjects and to voice its united feeling.

LIST OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chairman

REV. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., Ph.D.
Professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

Secretary

REV. SAMUEL McCRAE CAVERT
General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Members

ANDERSON, REV. STONEWALL, D.D.
Secretary of Education, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

BAKER, REV. JAMES CHAMBERLAIN, D.D.
Head of Wesley Foundation, University of Illinois.

BAUSLIN, REV. CHARLES S., D.D.
College Secretary of Board of Education of Lutheran Church in America.

BREWBAKER, REV. CHARLES W., Ph.D.
General Secretary, Sunday School and Brotherhood Office, United Brethren in Christ.

BROWN, CHANCELLOR ELMER E., Ph.D., LL.D.
Chancellor of New York University.

BROWN, REV. WILLARD DAYTON, D.D.
General Secretary, Board of Education Reformed Church in America.

BURTON, PROFESSOR ERNEST de WITT, D.D.
Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, University of Chicago.

BUTTERFIELD, PRESIDENT KENYON L., LL.D.
President of Massachusetts Agricultural College.

COFFIN, REV. HENRY SLOANE, D.D.
Pastor of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City.

COGSWELL, FRANKLIN D.
Educational Secretary of Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada.

CURRELL, PRESIDENT WILLIAM S., Ph.D., LL.D.
President of University of South Carolina.

CUTLER, MISS ETHEL
Secretary for Religious Education, Education and Research Division, National Board of Y.W.C.A.

EWING, ROBERT L.
Secretary, International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations.

GARDNER, REV. WILLIAM E., D.D.
Executive Secretary of Department of Religious Education of Protestant Episcopal Church.

- HERRICK, PRESIDENT CHEESMAN A., Ph.D., LL.D.
President of Girard College.
- HILL, REV. EDGAR P., D.D., LL.D.
General Secretary, General Board of Education of Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.
- JONES, REV. THOMAS JESSE, Ph.D.
Educational Director, Phelps Stokes Fund.
- KELLY, PRESIDENT ROBERT LINCOLN, LL.D.
Executive Secretary, Council of Church Boards of Education.
- KING, PRESIDENT HENRY CHURCHILL, D.D., LL.D.
President of Oberlin College.
- KNAPP, MISS MARY
- MACKENZIE, PRESIDENT WILLIAM DOUGLAS, D.D., LL.D.
President Hartford Seminary Foundation.
- MEYER, REV. HENRY H., D.D.
Editor of Sunday School Publications of Methodist Episcopal Church.
- MOTON, MAJOR ROBERT R., LL.D.
Principal of Tuskegee Institute.
- PADELFORD, REV. FRANK W., D.D.
Corresponding Secretary, Board of Education, Northern Baptist Convention.
- PENDLETON, PRESIDENT ELLEN F., Litt.D., LL.D.
President of Wellesley College.
- RICHARDS, PROFESSOR GEORGE W., D.D.
President of Theological Seminary of the Reformed Churches in U.S.
- SAILER, T. H. P., Ph.D.
Honorary Educational Advisor, Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and Associate in Religious Education at Teachers' College, Columbia University.
- SHELDON, REV. FRANK MILTON, D.D.
General Secretary of Congregational Educational Society.
- SNYDER, PRESIDENT HENRY NELSON, D.D., D.Litt.
President of Wofford College.
- SWEETS, REV. HENRY H., D.D., LL.D.
Secretary, Board of Education and Ministerial Relief, Presbyterian Church in U. S.
- THOMPSON, PRESIDENT WILLIAM O., D.D., LL.D.
President Ohio State University.
- TILLET, DEAN WILBUR FISK, D.D., LL.D.
Professor of Christian Doctrine and Dean Emeritus, Vanderbilt University.
- TIPPLE, PRESIDENT EZRA S., D.D., LL.D.
President of Drew Theological Seminary.
- WEIGLE, PROFESSOR LUTHER A., Ph.D., D.D.
Professor of Christian Nurture, Yale University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
1

Introduction	1
1. The relations of religion and education constitute a world-wide problem of the utmost significance.	
2. The secularization of education in America.	
3. World-wide causes responsible for the secularization of education.	
4. Causes for the secularization of education which are especially characteristic of America.	
5. The purpose of this report	
I. The Educational Function of the Christian Church.....	2
1. The essential place of religion in education.	
2. The educational conception of the Christian Church.	
3. The educational work of the Church includes:	
a. The religious nurture of individuals.	
b. Training for Christian leadership in institutions of higher education.	
c. The lifting of the Christian life above the level of habit and custom to the level of intelligence.	
II. Public Education in the United States	3
1. America's policy of public education.	
2. The enrollment in the public schools.	
3. The enrichment of the public school curriculum.	
4. Professor Dewey's theory of education.	
5. The omission of religion from American public schools.	
6. The danger involved in the secularization of public education	
7. Experiments in the correlation of religious education with public education.	
8. The duty of the churches with respect to the public schools	
9. The religious influence of public school teachers.	
III. The Present Status of Church Schools in the United States.....	8
1. The freedom of the churches to maintain schools.	
2. Parochial schools.	
a. Elementary parochial schools.	
b. Secondary parochial schools.	
c. The educational theory of the Roman Catholic Church.	
d. The possibility of understanding between Catholic and Protestant.	

3. The Sunday schools of the Nineteenth Century.
 - a. Their lack of gradation.
 - b. The International Uniform Lesson system.
 - (1) Is not pupil-centered.
 - (2) Does not provide a proper basis for the study of the Bible.
 - (3) Neglects important materials of religious education.
 - (4) Does not provide for Christian education through active service.
 - c. The Sunday school and other voluntary organizations.
4. The church schools of the Twentieth Century.
 - a. An educational awakening in the churches.
 - b. The new type of church schools.
 - c. The experiential character of the church school curricula.
 - d. The inclusive character of the church school organization.
5. The Christian family.
 - a. The educational function of the family.
 - b. The essential relation between Christianity and family life.
 - c. Changing conditions which render family life more difficult.
 - d. Modern attacks upon the family.
 - e. The interest of the Church in the maintenance and enrichment of Christian family life.

IV. The Church and Higher Education

17

1. The historical relation of the churches and the colleges.
2. Three types of colleges and universities.
 - a. Colleges and universities in direct relation with religious bodies.
 - b. Colleges and universities privately endowed and controlled.
 - c. State colleges and universities.
3. The secularization of the colleges.
4. Problems with respect to religion which are common to all types of colleges and universities.
 - a. The moral welfare of the students.
 - b. The place of religious worship in the corporate life of the institution.
 - c. The place of religion in the college and university curriculum.
 - d. Religious activity as an extra-curriculum voluntary interest of students.
 - e. The personal character and religious faith of the members of the faculty.
5. Problems with respect to religion which are peculiar to each of the three types of college and university.
 - a. Problems of the church college or university.
 - b. Problems of the private college or university.
 - c. Problems of the state college or university.

V. The Church Training Its Ministers	22
1. Protestant theological seminaries in the United States.	
2. The curricula of the seminaries.	
3. The need for a functional reorganization of the curriculum.	
4. The field work of theological students.	
5. Different types of theological seminaries.	
6. The contribution of the seminaries to higher education.	
7. The movement toward Christian unity and cooperation through the seminaries.	
8. The relation of theological seminaries to universities.	
VI. The Church and Public Opinion	26
1. The force of public opinion in America.	
a. In view of the facts of social psychology.	
b. In view of the political organization of the republic.	
c. In view of the separation of Church and State.	
2. Agencies which determine public opinion.	
3. The menace of propaganda.	
4. The Church's interest in public questions.	
a. Concerning industry.	
b. Concerning race problems.	
c. Concerning moral relations.	
d. Concerning international relations.	
5. The Church's equipment to learn the facts and determine the truth.	
6. The Church's means of influencing public opinion.	
a. Through the local church.	
b. Through denominational effort.	
c. Through interdenominational effort.	
7. The need for cooperation of the churches, and the growth of the spirit of cooperative education.	
VII. The Church and International Education	32
1. The new consciousness of interdependence.	
2. War as the common enemy of all mankind.	
3. The development of international good-will through the public schools.	
a. Defects of existing materials and methods.	
b. The new dangers of propaganda.	
c. Promoting good-will through the schools.	
4. The development of world friendship through the churches and church schools.	
5. The need of an international agency for Christian education.	
6. The call to Christian unity from the childhood and youth of the world.	
Bibliography	37

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The issues involved in the mutual relations of religion and education confront the present generation with a problem that is world-wide and of the utmost significance. Some keen observers think that the growing divorce between education and religion is one of the primary causes for the present distraught condition of the world, and that unless education can again be inspired by religious motives, and religion be given a place in education, under the new conditions of modern life and in the light of modern science, comparable with that which religion once held, human civilization is in danger of further disaster and ultimate ruin. It is to be hoped that, just as the Nineteenth Century has been marked by a great awakening of the Christian churches to their missionary opportunity and responsibility, the Twentieth Century may be marked by a like awakening in Christian education.

America is a land of churches and of schools. Most of its citizens profess religion and desire education. Yet in America, as throughout the world, a relative secularization of education has taken place within the last hundred years. The control of the schools has passed from the hands of the churches into those of the State; and religion has been almost wholly eliminated from the program and curriculum of public education.

This movement is due in part to causes which are world-wide. Among these causes are the rise and development of nationalism in education; the growth of the spirit, ideals and institutions of democracy; the rapid progress of invention and discovery, and the expansion of the sciences and arts; the utilitarianism and materialism consequent upon the industrial revolution; and the jealous sectarianism of the churches themselves.

Other causes are especially characteristic of America: the newness of the country, the relative lack of tradition, and the existence, until recently, of a frontier; the heterogeneity of the population; the complete religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; the multiplicity of religious sects and denominations which has resulted from that freedom; and the absolute separation of Church and State which is a fundamental principle of our political organization and corporate life. These causes have tended to accelerate movements toward the secularization of education which in Europe have been somewhat checked by the force of old customs and traditions and by the established connections of Church and State.

America's problems, therefore, with respect to the mutual relations of religion and education, are in some respects like, and in other respects unlike, those of our European brethren. It is the purpose of this report simply to set forth the more outstanding of these problems as a basis for discussion and the exchange of experience.

I. The Educational Function of the Christian Church

As Christians, we doubtless agree that religion is an essential part of education. The tragic issues of the past decade have made it clear that unless the development of intelligence and the increasing control of natural forces be animated by the spirit of good-will, and unless the growing knowledge of particular facts be integrated in a Christian view of the universe and of life, education may become the instrument of degeneration, even of destruction, rather than of human welfare and progress. Quite aside from the question as to whether or not the Church should undertake the maintenance of schools, it is clearly the Church's duty to endeavor, in one way or another, to contribute Christian principles and motives to the whole of education, and to inspire it with Christian ideals.

In a general but vital sense, indeed, the whole life and work of the Christian Church may be conceived in educational terms. The Church exists for the purpose for which its Master came, that men might have life and have it more abundantly. The primary interest of the Church is in persons; its concern is for the enrichment of their experience, the development of their character, and the quality of their service as free, responsible, cooperative members of the human race. In the power of the Spirit of God, the Church undertakes the regeneration of society through the regeneration and Christian education of individuals.

In a more direct and particular sense, the educational work of the Christian Church includes at least these major aspects:

(1) The fostering of growth in grace as the individual's powers mature and his experience widens and deepens. This includes both the Christian nurture and education of children, and provision for the religious growth and development of young people and adults.

(2) The fitting of young people, through institutions of higher education, for service in places of initiative, responsibility and leadership. This includes both the education in colleges and universities of laymen and laywomen generally, and the training in theological seminaries and similar schools of those who, as ordained ministers or as lay workers, will enter the direct service of the Church.

(3) The lifting of the Christian life above the level of habit and custom to the level of intelligence. This includes the intelligent understanding of the Church's own convictions, as these are grounded in the life and teachings of Jesus; the discovery of new truth and the understanding of the witness of the Spirit in the life of today; the application of Christian principles to the ever-new problems of changing civilization; the training of church members to render intelligent and effective service in the various fields of their opportunity; and the creation and maintenance among folk generally of a sound, true and effective public opinion.

II. Public Education in the United States

Provision for education is a matter of public policy in the United States. From the first, American statesmen have recognized the essential relation of education to political democracy. Education is a necessary qualification for the fulfillment of the duties of citizenship where government is "of the people, by the people, and for the people." "Promote then," said President Washington in his Farewell Address, "as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

In fulfillment of this policy the states have developed systems of public schools which have very largely displaced private and parochial schools in the elementary and secondary grades. These public schools are maintained by general taxation, from which no one is excused on the plea of conscientious objection or dissent from public educational policy. They are open, free of tuition charges, to all the children of all the people. Compulsory education laws, moreover, require parents and guardians to see to it that their children are educated.

Yet there is a remarkable degree of freedom in America's educational policy. There is no provision with respect to education in the Constitution of the United States, and there is no nationally controlled system of education—there are some, indeed, who feel that more should be done by the national government to promote education than has hitherto been attempted. The control of public education is in the hands of the states; and the various states differ in the degree to which they enforce standards upon the school authorities of local communities. Private schools and parochial schools are not forbidden, and attendance upon these schools is construed as a fulfillment of the compulsory education law. Further, these private and parochial schools are in many states practically unsupervised by the public authorities. Parents are free to send their children to public, private or parochial schools, as they may choose, or even to employ private tutors. One state (Oregon) recently passed a law compelling attendance at the public schools; but that law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of that State.

Nearly 20,000,000 pupils are enrolled in the elementary public schools; and a little more than 1,500,000 in private and parochial schools of elementary grade. Public schools of secondary grade have multiplied and grown astonishingly during the past fifty years. In 1870 there were about 500 free public high schools in this country; now there are more than 16,000 with an enrollment of over 2,000,000 pupils. The relative number of those attending private secondary schools has been steadily decreasing. As late as 1890 about one-third of the pupils attending secondary schools were in private institutions. Now 92 per cent. of the pupils attending schools of secondary grade are in the free public high schools.

The principle of free public education has been extended in this country even to institutions of higher education. In most states a state university is maintained at public expense, free of tuition charges to the children of citizens of that commonwealth; in some states there are other tax-supported institutions of college grade, notably colleges of agriculture and colleges for the training of teachers. About 40 per cent. of the college and university students of the country are enrolled in these public institutions.

This system of public schools and colleges constitutes as a whole a great and daring experiment in public education. It is one of the most characteristic and impressive features of American life. The amount of schooling received by the average American child has more than doubled in the last fifty years. More than that, the curriculum of public education has been greatly enriched. The public schools of today touch children's lives and influence their development at many more points than the schools of fifty years ago. The growth of knowledge and the application of science to the various fields of human industry; the development of invention, manufacture and commerce; the social and economic changes involved in the industrial revolution and in the massing of population in cities; and the correlative changes in home life, have opened to the schools new avenues of service and thrown upon them new duties.

In the elementary and secondary public schools of the better sort of today children learn not only reading, writing and arithmetic, the languages, and the traditional subjects of literature, history, and geography, but the physical and biological sciences and their applications; cooking, sewing, and household economy; carpentering and cabinet-making; metal working, forging, and the use and care of machinery; gardening, agriculture, dairying and stock-raising; stenography, type-writing, bookkeeping, and the economics of business; journalism and printing; drawing and painting, modeling and decorating; music, dancing, dramatic expression, and public speaking; gymnastics, athletics, physical education, personal hygiene, and the principles of public health. The fact is that under present conditions, we are relying upon these schools to afford to children much in the way of sense experience, motor training, and moral discipline which under simpler social conditions was afforded to children by the incidental contacts of everyday life in the home and the community.

Perhaps no better formula could be found to express this widening of the functions and enrichment of the curriculum of our schools than is embodied in the statement that the schools of today constitute a fairly faithful transcript or reproduction, on a small scale, of life itself. The schools are no longer mere instruments of drill in the clerical arts or transmitters of a conventional heritage of book knowledge; they constitute rather the fundamental means whereby society as a whole undertakes to reproduce itself and to shape its own progress. Education, the wisest of men have long said, is not a mere preparation for life; it is life itself. The schools of today have largely caught that

vision, and are seeking to realize it in their work. The field of their activity is as broad as life. Theoretically, no human interest or occupation lies without their purview. Practically, their failure to take account of any such interest or occupation is presumptive evidence of its lack of worth or importance.

No one has done more to interpret the educational significance of the changed conditions of modern life, and to formulate ideals for the school under these changed conditions, than John Dewey. His writings on the philosophy of education have been and are of profound influence in America, and its work has more or less directly inspired the training of many of the teachers in our schools. For Dewey, education faces toward the future rather than toward the past. It is the process whereby society reproduces its own life, perpetuates its interests and ideals, shapes its future, and ensures its progress. The end of education is not merely knowledge or power, but social efficiency, which includes, in a democratic society, the development of initiative, responsibility, and good-will. Such social efficiency, Dewey maintains, can be acquired only by actual participation in the life and activities of a democratic society. It is the business of the school, therefore, to foster such a society and to induce such participation on the part of children. The school should thus be a miniature world of real experiences, real opportunities, real interests, and real social relations. It must, of course, be a world simplified and suited to the active powers of children; it must be a world, moreover, widened, balanced, purified, and rightly proportioned as compared with the particular section of the grown-up world that lies immediately without its bounds; it is a world, again, which contains a teacher who is at once leader, inspirer, interpreter, and friend. But it is a real world which reflects the fundamental, truer interests and values of the world without. Within this school-world children learn by working rather than merely by listening or reading; develop originality, initiative, responsibility, and self-control by engaging in projects which call forth those qualities; and fit themselves for life by living and working together in cooperative, mutually helpful relations.

In one respect, however, neither the actual public schools of America nor the schools of Professor Dewey's educational theory are true to the life which they seek to transcribe, or to the society which it is their function to reproduce.—*They omit religion.* With the exception of the reading of a few verses from the Bible and the recital of the Lord's prayer in some states and communities, the teaching of religion has disappeared from the public schools of this country; and the program and curriculum of these schools afford no conscious recognition of the part that religion has played and is playing in the life of humanity. As for Professor Dewey's theory, his book on "Democracy and Education" contains but one explicit reference to religion, and that is a reference to what the author regards as the conflict of religious with scientific interests.

This situation would seem impossible if it were not true. Yet it does not mean that the American people are indifferent or hostile to religion,

or that there has been a purposed movement to take religion out of our schools. The secularization of public education in America has been incidental rather than purposed. It has been a by-product of the working out of the principle of public responsibility for education and the principle of religious freedom under the conditions, which have been noted above. Whenever a minority, or even an individual, has chosen to object, on what are averred to be conscientious grounds, to some religious element in the program or curriculum of the public schools, that element has forthwith been eliminated, and no other religious element has taken its place. The result of nearly one hundred and fifty years of this process has been to strip the public schools almost completely of direct religious teaching and religious worship.

This situation is fraught with danger. The omission of religion from the program of public education inevitably conveys a negative suggestion. Our children cannot help but notice the omission; and unless something be done, to correct it, they will in time conclude that religion is negligible or unimportant or out of relation to life.

As the public schools enlarge their scope, this negative suggestion becomes stronger. When the public schools concerned themselves with but a fraction of life, as they did a generation ago—when they did little more than drill children in the clerical arts and transmit to them a meager conventional heritage of book knowledge—when much, often the larger part, of education, was gotten outside of the schools, it was of little consequence that religion was omitted from their program. But today, when the public schools are taking on the dimensions of life itself, and when they undertake to furnish to children an environment, simplified, purified, widened, balanced and rightly proportioned, the omission of religion conveys a powerful condemnatory suggestion. The principle of the separation of Church and State must not be so construed as to render the State a fosterer of non-religion or of atheism. Yet that is precisely what we are in danger of doing in America today. We have too thoughtlessly accepted the idea that in view of the separation of Church and State, the public schools can have nothing to do with religion. Within the next generation we must face this problem directly and courageously, and determine in the light of a careful thinking through of the whole situation just what the principle of the separation of Church and State involves and what it does not involve with respect to the education of children, which is so obviously the function of both.

There is a general awakening to the danger of the present situation. Public school men, business men and legislators, as well as leaders of the Church, are concerned about it. In many parts of the country various experiments at a better correlation of religious education with public education are being made. In a few communities courses in Biblical literature and history are offered by the public schools; in many more communities credit is given by the public schools for Bible study or religious education conducted by other agencies. The plan which has met with most favor is that whereby the public schools grant an

hour or two of time from their weekly schedule, during which children may be taught in weekday schools of religion maintained by the churches. This movement was first effective in connection with the public schools of Gary, Indiana, and is spreading rapidly. Such weekday schools of religion are now maintained in more than one thousand cities, towns and rural communities. The State of Minnesota recently passed a law definitely empowering local school boards to excuse children from public school attendance for not more than three hours a week in order that they might attend weekday religious instruction under the direction of the churches.

Two considerations give ground for hope that, through experiment and wise statesmanship both in Church and State, a way may be found out of the present dangerous situation, without compromise of the principle of religious freedom or the principle of public responsibility for education in a democracy. One is the fact that the secularization of public education in this country has been incidental rather than purposed. The other is the fact that it is the churches themselves, or members of the churches, who have been chiefly responsible for it. Even the religious heterogeneity of our population does not necessitate the present degree of exclusion of religion from public education. It is because we have held our different religious views and practices in so jealous, divisive, and partisan a fashion that the State has been obliged to withdraw religion from the curriculum and program of its schools. It is significant that while religion is often ignored in the constitutional and legislative provisions of the several states concerning public education, it is almost never forbidden nor declared against, although laws against sectarianism in the school abound.

Can the churches of America become less sectarian and more religious in their attitude toward the education of their children? If they can, the greatest obstacle to a proper recognition of religion by the public schools will be removed. No less urgent than the call to Christian unity that comes from the mission fields or the realm of a disordered international life, is the call of the present educational situation in America. If our children and our children's children are to give to religion its rightful place in education and in life, the churches must come together in mutual understanding and must cooperate, more largely and more responsibly than they have hitherto done, in a common educational policy. Only thus can they rise above the necessity of competition and make it possible for the public school to cooperate with them instead of ignoring them.

The way out of the present situation lies with the churches. It is because we have here not the State and the Church, nor even the State and a group of cooperating churches, but rather the State and half a hundred disagreeing churches, without a common educational purpose or policy, and most of them without a well-defined educational policy of their own, that it has been necessary for the State, in the fulfillment of its educational function, to pass the churches by. Let that situation cease,

let the churches agree on an educational policy with respect both to their own teaching work and to the sort of recognition that they desire religion to be afforded by and in the public schools, let them do their share of the work of education in a way that merits recognition, and a fit measure of recognition is made possible and will almost certainly follow.

One thing further should in justice be said. The most potent religious influence in the life of any school is to be found in the moral and religious character of the teacher. The public schools of America are not irreligious because their teachers are almost everywhere men and women of strong moral character and of definite religious conviction. Without the direct teaching of religion, these teachers, by the character of their discipline and by the spirit which they maintain in the life of the schools, have been and are of profound influence in determining the character of American boys and girls.

III. The Present Status of Church Schools in the United States

The emphasis which has just been laid upon public education must not obscure the fact that the churches of America are free to maintain schools, whether of elementary, secondary or college grade, and whether for the purpose of education in general or for the specific purpose of education in religion. The truth is, moreover, that the churches have rendered effective service, throughout our history, in the establishment and maintenance of schools and colleges of every grade.

In colonial days the churches generally, save in New England, where it was not necessary on account of the existence of public schools, maintained elementary schools for the children of those who could not afford to pay for their tuition in private schools. As the public school system became established throughout the country, most of the churches surrendered the idea of maintaining elementary parochial schools. The outstanding exceptions to this rule are certain German-speaking branches of the Lutheran Church, and the Roman Catholic Church. The latter, particularly, dissents in principle from the established policy of public education; and, especially since the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884, has labored strenuously to provide strong parochial schools organized into diocesan system, for the education of Catholic children. There are now about 5,500 Catholic elementary schools, with an enrollment of 1,450,000 pupils. It will be noted that this constitutes more than 90 per cent of the enrollment in all private and parochial schools of elementary grade, a fact which shows how completely the Protestant churches have withdrawn from the field of elementary general education.

In the field of secondary education the churches rendered their greatest service in the first half of the Nineteenth Century, by the fostering, directly and indirectly, of the establishment of academies. In 1850 there were in the United States over 6,000 such institutions, with an enrollment of 263,000 pupils. The majority of these schools were not directly connected with the churches; but a great many were so con-

nected, and practically all gave to religion a prominent place in their program and curriculum, and owed their existence and support in greater or less degree to the devotion of church members to those ideals of religion and education for which the churches stood. After 1850 the academies gave place rapidly to the growing system of free public high schools. Today there are less than 2,000 private high schools and academies in the United States, with a reported enrollment in 1922 of 186,641 pupils. Nearly three-fourths of these schools, 1,433, with an enrollment of 135,334, are connected with the churches. Nearly two-thirds of those connected with the churches are Roman Catholic. The number of secondary schools maintained by the Protestant churches has been steadily diminishing; but the Roman Catholic Church has been striving zealously to establish new secondary schools throughout the past forty years, with the result that 949 Catholic secondary schools were reported in 1922 as contrasted with 280 in 1895. A competent Catholic historian estimates that one-half of the Catholic children in America attend Catholic elementary schools, and that one-third of the Catholic children of secondary school age, who go to school at all, attend Catholic secondary schools.

These facts indicate one of the major points of difference between Protestant and Catholic in America today. The Protestant churches desire their children to be educated in the public schools, and have therefore almost entirely ceased to make provision for general education in the elementary and secondary grades. The Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, does not believe in the principle of public education as this has become established in the life of America. The State, according to its belief, has no primary right or function as an educator of children; that right and function belong to the parent, and ultimately to the Church. Education as a whole is a unitary process, it holds, which must include religion at every point; and the State is not competent to teach religion. The State may, therefore, levy and collect taxes for the support of schools and may set standards which it requires schools to maintain in certain subjects, but it is the business of the Church to carry on, through the schools of the Church, the education of childhood and youth. Roman Catholic authorities object to what they deem to be the injustice of the present situation, in that Catholics are taxed to support public schools to which they do not send their children, while the State refuses to return to them any share of the public funds for the support of their parochial schools, for the maintenance of which they voluntarily tax themselves again. Definite demands for a share of the public funds were made by Catholics in various sections of the country in the middle of the Nineteenth Century, with the final result that almost all the states passed constitutional provisions forbidding the appropriation of any public funds for the support of sectarian schools. The only hope of securing public subsidies for parochial schools lies in gaining a sufficient majority to repeal these constitutional provisions.

It is hard for Catholic and Protestant to understand one another at this point. To the Protestant, the Catholic principle of subsidies for parochial education would involve the breaking up of the American public school system, since the privilege granted to the Catholics must in equity be granted to other churches, and possibly, indeed, to other groups, such as political parties and trade unions. The Catholic Church cannot be the one exception. The Catholic, on the other hand, claims to be no enemy to the public schools, and wishes, indeed, to retain the term "public schools" as a name for schools conducted by the Church, but maintained in whole or in part by public funds. He can see no reason, moreover, why the public schools of the country, under these conditions, may not be separated into three groups,—Catholic, Protestant and Jewish.

Yet mutual understanding is possible. Catholics are serving on many public school boards and are teaching in many public schools, to the satisfaction of citizens generally, of whatever creed. And in a number of the cities and towns where experiments in week-day religious education are being conducted, in cooperation with the public schools, the Catholic and Protestant churches have joined in the agreement which made the experiment possible. Catholic and Protestant alike desire the religious education of their children. They differ in that the Catholic holds that the whole of education, to be religiously motivated, must be in the hands of the Church, whereas the Protestant believes that the Church can so cooperate with the public school as to make religion effective in education, even though the whole process be not under the Church's control. The Catholic has fairly well established the proof of his theory; it does succeed in training good Catholics. It remains for the Protestant to prove that his theory will work; for it has not really been tried, in thoroughgoing fashion, under the conditions of modern life. If the Protestant churches will try it and succeed, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the Catholic Church in this country may modify its policy of reliance upon parochial education and move in the direction of a larger dependence upon the public schools, with correlated religious education in church schools maintained for the specific purpose of teaching religion.

If the Protestant churches are to succeed in this correlation of religious education with public education, they must emancipate themselves more completely than they have yet done from certain habits acquired in the Nineteenth Century. In this period catechetical instruction declined in all the evangelical churches; and these churches depended generally, except in the more liturgical communions, upon successive waves of spiritual revival for the conversion and enlistment even of the children of their own members. Most churches had no definite well-planned policy for the religious education of children; they failed to realize the larger educational responsibility which was being thrown upon them by the increasing secularization of the public schools.

For the most part they surrendered the religious training of the children to various volunteer associations and agencies which sprang up, in more or less loose connection with the churches, to meet definite, specific needs. The most important and widespread of these agencies was the Sunday school. For more than a century this has been the institution upon which the churches have relied for the teaching of religion to the young.

The Sunday schools of America have rendered great service to the Kingdom of Christ, but it has been in spite of, rather than because of certain characteristics which have rendered them less effective than it seems that they might have been. The Sunday schools of the Nineteenth Century were ungraded, and manned by untrained volunteer teachers, who too often had few qualifications for the teaching office besides evangelistic fervor. These schools generally lacked organic connection with the churches with which they were associated. They afforded to their pupils but half an hour a week, often less, of class teaching. And they used in this teaching the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons.

The initiation and wide adoption of the International Uniform Sunday School Lesson system in 1872 was a great step forward. These lessons were "uniform" in two senses: first, in that practically all the Sunday schools of all save two or three communions united in adopting this system of lessons; second, that there was but one lesson provided for all the pupils in the school, of whatever age and grade. In the first sense of the term, the uniformity of the Sunday school lessons has constituted one of the most widespread and significant instances, in the history of Protestantism, of cooperation between the denominations. In the second sense of the term, the uniformity of the lessons seems to have been a necessary step in the development of the Sunday school, and did much to establish its place, in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century, as the foremost agency of Bible study.

This uniformity, however, has increasingly become a limitation, standing in the way of the fuller development and larger usefulness of the Sunday school as an institution of religious education. The Uniform Lesson system is not pupil centered; it fails to make provision for the successive stages in the child's moral and religious development, and affords no special nurture or guidance in those periods which are generally recognized as of critical importance. It contains within itself no principle of progression, and does not permit of any real correlation or connection with the rest of the pupil's education in public school and college. Since it must provide a series of lesson topics which can be used by everyone in the school, it is restricted to materials which lie in general at about the level of the comprehension of pupils from ten to fifteen years of age. Lessons so chosen are often unsuited, necessarily, to the understanding and religious needs of little children; and are inadequate to the intellectual, moral and religious needs of the more mature young people and adults.

The Uniform Lesson system, again, does not provide a proper basis for the study of the Bible. The attempt to choose passages from the Bible which can serve as a common body of lesson material for all of the school, from oldest to youngest, results necessarily in an over-emphasis of the narrative portions of the Bible, especially those shorter passages describing incidents which lend themselves readily to the drawing of distinct moral inferences, to the relative neglect of the Psalms, the writings of the great prophets, the Wisdom literature, and the Epistles. Yet the portions of the Bible thus slighted are, with the exception of the Gospels, the highest in religious value. The tendency of the Uniform Lessons, in view of these limitations, is to afford the pupils but a fragmentary knowledge of the history of the Hebrew people and the early Church, and to give them almost no conception of the richness of the literature contained in the Bible and of the sweep and perspective of God's progressive revelation of Himself in this literature and in the life that it records.

At the same time the Uniform Lesson system is limited to material chosen from the Bible; and the schools using these lessons have tended to conceive their function in terms of instruction merely. The result of the first of these limitations is that pupils studying these lessons gain no understanding of such vitally important matters as the history of the Christian Church; the place of Christianity and Christian leaders in mediaeval and modern history; the comparison of Christianity with other religions; the development and present opportunity of Christian missions; the Christian approach to the social problems and movements of the world today; even the everyday problems of personal morality and social justice. It is tragic that the public schools should omit these matters; and then that the schools upon which the churches have relied to teach religion should neglect them as well, limiting themselves simply to the interpretation of scattered Biblical narratives. How, in this situation, can children learn to understand and appreciate Christianity as a living religion? The argument is not that less time and study should be given to the Bible; we need more and better teaching of the Bible than this system makes possible. But the curriculum of religious education should be far richer than this, and should be centered more definitely about the developing problems, choices and experiences of children as they live and move in the world of today. So only can the young be fitted to understand and to do God's will in these days of world-wide missionary effort, of vast and complex social problems, and of a possible social regeneration that may bring the world measurably nearer to the Kingdom of God.

The result of the Sunday schools' policy of instruction merely, to the neglect of the essential place of activity in all sound educational method, as well as in all true religious development, has been that there has sprung up, within and about the churches, a multitude of other organizations for the training of children and young people in wholesome social living and in the attitudes, habits and group activities associated

with various forms of Christian service. Boy's clubs and girls' clubs of various sorts, societies of Christian Endeavor and other young people's societies, temperance societies, Boys' Brigades, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Knights of King Arthur, King's Daughters, mission-study groups and missionary societies of various ages—the list might be multiplied almost indefinitely. In many churches these organizations operate more or less independently, without relation to the Sunday school, and with policies and programs determined by their district, state and national affiliations rather than by their place within the local church's educational system. There is duplication, overlapping and competition, on the one hand, and on the other, failure to provide fully for all ages and sexes. Worst of all, there is the educational inefficiency involved in a situation which leaves instruction and activity sundered—the Sunday school with a program of instruction unapplied in the group life of its pupils, and the other organizations with programs of activity unrelated to the instruction which their members are receiving week after week in the Sunday school.

With the opening of the present Century the Protestant churches began to awake to the danger involved in the omission of religion by otherwise competent public schools, and the throwing of the burden of religious education upon educationally incompetent Sunday schools. In 1903 the Religious Education Association was organized, with the declared purpose "to inspire the educational forces of our country with the religious ideal, to inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal, and to keep before the public mind the ideal of religious education and the sense of its need and value." In 1908, after years of criticism and agitation, the International Sunday School Association authorized the Lesson Committee to construct and issue a graded series of Sunday school lessons, with distinct material for each year of the pupil's school life. In 1910 the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations was organized, marking the more definite assumption by the several denominations of responsibility for the educational work of their Sunday schools and for the training of teachers. In 1920 a reorganization of the old International Sunday School Association was begun whereby it was merged with the newer Sunday School Council. The body thus created, bearing the name of the International Council of Religious Education, is the recognized agency of the Protestant churches for cooperative effort in the field of the religious education of children and youth. In 1920, moreover, the International Sunday School Lesson Committee decided to move as rapidly as possible toward the issuance of graded lessons only. Beginning with 1924 it is putting this policy into effect by substituting for the Uniform Lessons, for children under twelve years of age, graded lessons of two types—graded by years and graded by three-year age-groups.

These dates and items represent but a few outstanding factors in a movement greater far than any single organization or group of organizations. The fact is that the Protestant churches of America have

begun to experience a genuine educational revival. Thousand of Sunday schools in all parts of the country have been graded, have broadened their vision and enriched their curriculum. In many communities week-day schools of religion have been established, either by single churches or by the cooperative effort of the Protestant churches. These week-day schools meet sometimes once, sometimes five times a week and make possible a larger amount of religious training for our children. The Daily Vacation Bible Schools held in many churches during the summer season serve this same purpose. Problems of curriculum, methods and organization are being studied in an experimental and scientific way. New buildings are being erected for their schools by the more progressive churches, designed with a view to their educational utility and furnished with adequate material equipment. Classes for the training of teachers are maintained by most churches; and community training schools are multiplying. Thousands of teachers and prospective teachers of religion gather for one to six weeks of training in summer schools conducted by the denominations and by other organizations. Many of the larger churches are employing paid teachers of religion and directors of religious education. Courses in religious education have been organized and professorships of religious education established in colleges and theological seminaries, so that young men who are now entering the Christian ministry are being trained not simply to preach and to care for a parish, but to direct the educational work of a church.

All of this means that a new type of church school is being developed—a church school for the teaching of religion, maintained by the local church or a group of neighboring churches, for children whose education in other respects is provided for in the public schools. These newer church schools are graded in the same way as the public schools; they provide for the religious education of children through activity as well as through instruction; and their schedule includes week-day as well as Sunday hours.

There are over 180,000 Sunday schools in the United States, with an enrollment of 20,000,000 pupils. About one-half of these schools use graded lessons in whole or in part; and one-half still use nothing other than the Uniform Lesson system. A rapidly growing number of schools of the former group are being transformed by incorporation into the wider and richer educational program to which the term "the church school" is applied.

The present movement for the organization of church schools is frankly experimental. It is meeting much success; but no one yet knows just what form of organization, or what scheme of curriculum, is best. Many are being tried.

It seems clear, however, that the curriculum of the church school should be experiential in character, and its program of organization inclusive. This principle may best be expounded, doubtless, in terms of Professor Dewey's theory of the school, referred to in a former sec-

tion of this report. He holds, we remember, that the school should be, not so much a place in which to read about experiences, as a place where children may have experiences. It should be a fellowship of young folk, living and working together, under the leadership of a teacher; a fellowship within which children may have experiences of discovery, perplexity, problem-solving, initiative, cooperation, responsibility, self-control, obedience to truth, and the like, and may develop desirable qualities of mind and heart and will by being afforded opportunity and stimulus to exercise these qualities.

Whatever we may think with respect to the possibility of the public schools' realization of such a theory of their function, this theory is clearly suggestive and helpful with respect to the church school. The church school should be, not so much a place where children may learn something or other about religion, as a place where they may experience religion. It should be a fellowship of children associated in Christian living, under the leadership of the Church, and consequently growing in Christian experiences and acquiring Christian habits, attitudes, motives, ideals and beliefs.

The curriculum of the church school should therefore be pupil-centered, rather than material-centered, as Sunday school lessons have too often been. Instead of starting with a given body of material, and asking the question at what ages we may most profitably teach the different sections of this material, a truer method of curriculum-making starts with the children. It asks what are the opportunities, problems and experiences that are normal at each stage of developing childhood; and it undertakes so to order the situations into which it brings children and the material which it makes accessible to them, as to help them meet these opportunities, solve these problems and have these experiences.

The church school, so conceived, is inclusive. It cannot be confined merely to the Sunday hour, or to the type of effort which the Sunday school has ordinarily represented. Its curriculum embodies more than instruction; it includes the experience of worship, the experiences of fellowship, of giving, of cooperation, of service—indeed, the whole range of experiences that enter normally into the development of Christian life and character. And so the church school will include, as an organic part of its program and organization, all lesser clubs, societies and groups which the church maintains for the Christian education of its children and young people. The church school is another name for the church itself, undertaking, with a consciously educative purpose, to make its own life and experience available to oncoming generations.

In the face of this emphasis upon church schools, it must not be forgotten that the moral and religious education of children depends very largely upon the life of the family of which they are members. The whole work of education can never be accomplished by schools, whether public schools or church schools, however wisely these may be planned and administered. The family in its home life has the child first, and

the impressions which he then receives serve as background, foundation and apperceptive basis for all subsequent education; it has the child, moreover, in his most impressionable years, and educates him by methods of constant contact and association, with influences all the more vital because they are for the most part indirect and unnoticed. Horace Bushnell held that the first three years of a child's life are more important as a general fact, in their bearing upon education and character, than all the years of discipline that may come afterward.

The influence of family life are of especial importance in their bearing upon the growing character of the child. Here is a little group of old and young, mature and immature, living together in mutual affection, placing personal values first, constrained by the manifold contacts of their common life each to have regard for the things of the other, always giving and receiving service, with the opportunities for helpfulness, unselfishness, and even self-sacrifice, so constant as to make these a matter of course,—what finer soil for the virtues, what better training ground for character, could there be? We may well doubt whether this moral function of the family could ever be fulfilled by any other institution. Schools may take over the larger part of the education of children; and the state may exercise supervision and control in many matters that, under simpler conditions of life, were left to the parent. The life of the school and the service of the state, moreover, can do much to bring out the sturdier virtues and to train the character of the young. But these must deal with children in large groups and in relatively cold and impersonal ways. They can never beget and train the inner emotional springs of the moral life as the family does in its atmosphere of personal affection, love, and loyalty. Were there no family, the state would doubtless be obliged to invent some such small social groupings as might be expected, in some measure, to fulfill its function in this respect. Public institutions do something of the sort when they adopt the policy of house or cottage dormitories; colleges, when they permit the organization of fraternities. But no substitute that has yet been tried or imagined can take the place, morally, of a real home, or compensate for the loss of father and mother and the lack of genuine family life.

There is an essential relation, moreover, between Christianity and the institution of the family. The Christian religion universalizes the relations of family life. Jesus' teachings concerning God as well as concerning human duty, are based upon these relations. God, he tells us, is our Father; and we are all brethren. Our understanding of these teachings depends upon the quality of our own family life. It is the privilege and responsibility of the parent to interpret God to his children in terms of his own character, and so to direct the spirit of his family that it may fitly serve as the type for all good social living. A Christian family is one which, established in the Christian convictions of the parents, seeks so to express these convictions in its spirit and practice that its children may grow up to be children of God.

Changing conditions are rendering family life more difficult. The social and economic changes consequent upon the industrial revolution, the transfer of industry from homes to factories and offices, the massing of the population in cities, the increased mobility due to the development of systems of transportation and communication, the specialization of all sorts of work and the consequent commercialization of life, together with the changing status of woman, involve changes in the character of the home, and confront the family with new and perplexing problems.

The family is under fire today. The traditional attack of socialism upon the family has been based upon the idea that it is an outgrowth of the principle of private property. The present attack upon family life has assumed a more subtle and insidious form, and is more widespread than conscious adherence to any type of socialism. This attack is associated with the rising current of feminism and the development of the so-called new psychology; and it is based upon a changed attitude toward sex which insists upon regarding the field of sex relations as a range for the assertion of individual freedom and the satisfaction of individual desire rather than the field of the most sacred of human affections and most creative of human responsibilities.

The Christian Church is vitally interested in maintaining the integrity of the family as a social institution in adjustment to and in control of the new conditions of modern life. It may best do this if it keeps clear its convictions respecting the necessity of the family as an agency of moral and religious education. The family began because there were children to be cared for and taught. It must continue for the same reason. The Christian Church, following its Master, should place the child in the midst. It is for the sake of the child that the family exists. It is not merely to enjoy one another that a man and woman are joined in marriage, but that they may undertake the creative responsibility of parenthood. The physical begetting of the child's body is but the beginning of the education of the child's soul. The Church must consistently maintain the point of view of Christian parenthood as the only sound basis for a discussion of sex relations, and it must find in the maintenance and enrichment of Christian family life one of its most fundamental problems and opportunities.

IV. The Church and Higher Education

Most of the colleges of America have been founded by the churches or by Christian people who have had a distinct religious purpose. A pamphlet entitled "New England's First Fruits," published in London in 1643, states the motive which led the Puritans immediately to the establishment of schools and a college: "After God had carried us safe to New England and we had builded our houses, provided the necessities for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity,

dreeding to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministers shall lie in the dust." The motives for higher education have widened, yet the churches have continued, throughout the nearly three centuries that have since elapsed, to render notable service by the establishment of colleges wherever the need was manifest. The contribution of the churches to higher education has been more effective and permanent than their service to elementary and secondary education. It is a contribution, moreover, that has often been sacrificial, for churches have given out of their poverty that colleges might be maintained in frontier communities; and it has usually been self-forgetting, for the churches have sought to minister, through these institutions, not merely to their own interests, but to the general welfare.

Each of the nine colleges established in the colonial period avowed a distinct religious purpose; and but one (that at Philadelphia which in time became the University of Pennsylvania) was undenominational. Of the 246 colleges founded by the close of the year 1860, only 17 were state institutions. Since 1860 the number of state colleges and universities maintained by public funds has greatly increased, and the relative influence of these institutions has grown. There are now 670 colleges and universities in the United States. These may be divided into three distinct groups: (a) colleges and universities in direct relation with religious bodies, and in varying measure under their control, 506; (b) colleges and universities privately endowed and controlled, many of which have a religious origin and history, and still maintain sympathetic relationship with the churches, 62; (c) state colleges and universities maintained by public funds, 102.

A degree of secularization has marked the development of all three of these types of institution throughout the last half century. This is due to the causes which have brought about the secularization of education in general—notably, to the heterogeneous character of the population and to the presence in these institutions of students drawn from groups which differ widely in religious beliefs and practices. The development of the sciences and arts, moreover, and the progress of invention and discovery have overcrowded the curriculum of the colleges and universities with new subjects, and have induced specialization in education as in other fields. The faculties, even of the colleges of liberal arts, have been organized into distinct departments, each with a more or less narrow, sharply-defined special field. There has been little time or inclination for courses dealing with the meaning of life as a whole; and the elective system, whereby students choose the courses which engage their interest, has permitted all varieties of combination. On the whole, doubtless, there is less of definite, direct, conscious religious influence and content in the curriculum and life of American colleges today than there was two generations ago.

Certain problems with respect to the place of religion in the curriculum and corporate life of the institution are common to all three types of college and university.

One of these problems is that of the moral life of the students. To what degree shall the moral welfare of the students body be guarded by rules and restrictions, or shall all oversight be rejected as paternalistic? Practically all of the colleges and universities of America make definite provision for the moral guidance and welfare of their students, although institutions differ in the degree to which this oversight is embodied in rules and restrictions devised by the faculty. Self-government among the students is developed to an encouraging degree. In some institutions the responsibility of the students for the government of their own life finds expression in definite organizations recognized by the faculty as cooperating bodies; in other institutions there is less of formal organization, but a strongly developed sense of honour and an effective public opinion within the student body.

Another problem is that of the place of religious worship in the corporate life of the institution. Shall there be required attendance at daily chapel or at Sunday services, or shall this be left to the free choice of the individual student? Shall there be a college church, or shall students be expected to affiliate with the churches of their choice in the community in which the college is placed? While institutions differ widely in their provision for chapel and church services, some such provision finds a place in the life of practically all of the colleges and universities of the United States. In some, attendance at both daily and Sunday services is voluntary; in many institutions, on the other hand, attendance at the daily chapel service is required of undergraduates. There is a distinct tendency toward the maintenance of a Sunday service especially for students in the college chapel, as contrasted with the reliance simply upon the services of worship maintained by the local churches. Yet the danger is recognized of thus loosening the bonds that unite the student to his church, and in one form or another the affiliation of students with the local churches of the college community is encouraged, and many denominations are making special provision through college pastors to minister more effectively to the moral and religious life of their student members.

Religion is better provided for in the curriculum of the college and university, in general, than in the curricula of the elementary and secondary schools. Traditionally, religion, or subjects closely associated with it, always had a place in the college curriculum. Courses in Evidences of Christianity, Natural Theology, and the like, were general. In the comparative secularization of the colleges which was characteristic of the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century, these courses for the most part disappeared. More recently there has been a movement among the colleges toward the organization of distinct departments of Biblical Literature, Religion, or Religious Education. Many institutions, moreover, are seeking to teach religion, not simply as one subject among others, but as a principle which undergirds and contributes to the integration of the entire curriculum. An interesting development in some colleges is the requirement that students take, in their freshman

or sophomore year, what may be termed an orientation course, related to the curriculum as a whole in somewhat the same way that the course in theological propaedeutic was formerly related to the curriculum of a theological seminary. This course, which in some institutions bears the title of Contemporary Civilization, is designed to help the student find his bearings and gain some appreciation of the relations of the various subjects to one another and to human life as a whole. It necessarily raises questions with respect to the meanings and values of life and brings the student face to face with problems of morality and religion.

Various religious activities, moreover, have a large place in the life of American colleges and universities as an extra-curriculum, voluntary interest of students. The vast majority of the students in these institutions come from Christian homes, and claim membership in, or affiliation with, the churches. Colleges have reported as high as 96 per cent. of their students as claiming church affiliation; and it is not unusual even for a state university to report 70 or 80 per cent. of its students as church adherents. Even in several states where Catholic immigration has reduced the proportion of Protestants to as low as 37 per cent. of the total population, no less than 75 per cent. of the college and university students come from this part of the population. It is natural, therefore, that these students should express their religious convictions in voluntary ways, and that, in one form or another, religion should constitute one of their extra-curriculum interests. The Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Student Volunteer Movement, and other national organizations, have rendered effective service as instruments of this voluntary religious interest; and there are many local organizations serving like ends, in the various colleges and universities. In the first decade of the Nineteenth Century, the work of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions began in an extra-curriculum prayer-meeting of students at Williams College; and in the Twentieth Century we find college students maintaining a Yale-in-China, an Oberlin-in-China and a hundred like enterprises. The work of home missions in America has depended largely upon the interest of such students as those who made up the Illinois Band and the Iowa Band. Today we find students maintaining a Hope Mission for down-and-outers in a great city, teaching English to classes of immigrants, and serving as scoutmasters and church school teachers. The assumption by college students of responsibility for their own religious and philanthropic organizations, and the directing of their religious impulses into objective channels of service, are among the brightest features of student life in this country.

The personal character and religious faith of the members of the faculty go farther, perhaps, than any other single factor to determine the moral and religious influence of a college or university. This is not so much because students emulate their preceptors as because the attitudes and beliefs of a teacher are reflected in incidental references

and allusions, and in the total perspective of his teaching. He becomes to the student an authority, whether he will or not, at every point where his subject touches upon religion. He is set to teach the truth; and the truth is not simply the bare facts in a special field, but the total perspective in which these facts are set. It is natural, therefore, that qualifications of character and religious influence should be considered, as well as qualifications of scholarship and teaching ability, in the choice of members of faculties. This is true of American colleges and universities rather generally. It is possible, of course, to administer this principle with undue narrowness and sectarianism; but this is not characteristic of most institutions.

Each of the three types of institutions has distinct problems of its own, with respect to the place of religion in its curriculum and corporate life.

The college or university controlled by a church is fortunate, usually, in the Christian purpose which underlies its work, and in the Christian environment with which it surrounds its students. It must be careful to maintain the freedom of its faculty to teach the truth, unbiased by sectarian considerations; and it must undertake not simply to mold its students to the traditions of a group, but to afford to them the emancipating influences of a larger vision and fellowship.

The college or university which is privately endowed and controlled by a self-perpetuating corporation is fortunate in its freedom. Many such colleges maintain relations of sympathy and cooperation, not only with the churches with which they have close historical association, but with the churches generally. There is a significant example of a college (Carleton, in Minnesota) founded by Congregationalists but independently controlled, as all Congregational colleges are, which has not only maintained the friendship and commanded the continued support of the Congregational churches, but has recently been adopted, without change of charter or loss of Congregational interest by the general bodies of the Baptist and Episcopal churches of the state in which it is located. It is possible, on the other hand, for the independent college to lose touch with religious forces, and even to lose its own soul of devotion to the higher values of life. It is possible, again, for such an institution to fail to maintain contact with the developing life of democracy, and to become aristocratic. It is possible, too, that the self-perpetuating corporation of the independent college may govern the institution in the interest of a class, or may unduly limit the freedom of its professors to teach the truth as they understand it, without there being recourse of appeal to a larger body responsible for the policies of the institution.

The college or university maintained by the state and supported by taxation has an organic connection with the public school system, and must meet the needs of a democratic society. There is a multiplicity of demands upon the resources of these institutions, with a tendency toward over-emphasis upon utilitarian values; and they are over-

crowded with students. They share the limitation of the public schools with respect to the teaching of religion. The churches are succeeding, however, in cooperating more effectively with the higher public institutions in the interest of the religious welfare of their students than with the elementary and secondary public schools. Promising experiments are those whereby religious Foundations are being established, and cooperating Schools of Religion maintained by the churches, in connection with some of the larger state universities. It is possible that the problem of the cooperation of Church and State in the interest of education, without abridging the freedom of either or infringing upon their separation, may first be worked out upon the level of the college rather than upon that of the elementary or secondary schools.

V. The Church Training Its Ministers

We have seen that dread of an illiterate ministry was one of the motives that led the citizens of Massachusetts Bay to establish Harvard College. Throughout the Eighteenth Century, young men preparing for the ministry were trained in the colleges, most of which, like Harvard, had been founded with this purpose in view, or by private study under the direction of an eminent preacher like the Rev. Joseph Bellamy of Bethlehem, Connecticut, who is said to have trained more than one hundred candidates for ordination. In the early Nineteenth Century theological seminaries began to be organized as distinct professional schools. There are now 131 Protestant theological seminaries in the United States, with an aggregate enrollment of about 10,000 students. In June, 1922, 880 men graduated from these institutions with the B. D. degree, and 675 with diplomas or certificates. At the same time 600 men were graduated from the Roman Catholic seminaries into the priesthood of that Church.

The central importance of the theological seminary in the Church's educational work is so obvious as to need no comment. The character of a church depends, more than on any other one factor, upon the character of the men who, as leaders of worship, preachers, pastors, parish administrators, directors of religious education, and interpreters of the meaning and mission of Christianity, constitute its spiritual leaders. And the quality of their leadership depends largely upon the breadth, thoroughness and spirit of their training. The truth is, however, that no part of the educational work of the churches of America is more difficult to describe than this. It is in theological education, naturally, that the lines of denominational division are most sharply drawn. Each denomination, wishing to perpetuate the truth as it sees it, and to fit men for future service within its own organization, tends in training these men to emphasize strongly the distinctive beliefs and practices which separate it from other denominations. In no phase of American education, therefore, is there more lack of agreement than here. There is wide variation both of theory and of practice with respect to the aims, methods and content of the theological curriculum.

Of the 131 Protestant seminaries, 120 are denominational and 11 are in no way controlled by a denomination. The seminaries of the latter group enroll one-fifth of the aggregate student enrollment of all the seminaries.

Most of the better theological seminaries are professional schools of graduate standing—that is, they require college graduation as a prerequisite for admission. This requirement is not administered in rigid fashion, however, and mature students may be admitted to most institutions on examination or by special vote of the faculty, even though they lack a college degree. Other seminaries require but two years of college work as a prerequisite for entrance; some only a high school education; and some adhere to no definite scholastic standards for admission. In general, the movement is toward recognition of the desirability of college graduation as a qualification for entrance upon theological study. In practically all seminaries three years of study are required for the B. D. degree or the theological diploma.

With the exception of the problems centering about a larger measure of unity and cooperation, the outstanding problems of the theological seminaries are those that concern the curriculum. To the traditional subjects of the Biblical languages and literature, theology, church history, homiletics and liturgics, there have been added in recent years a wealth of new subjects dealing with the application of Christian principles to the life of today, and with various phases of the minister's practical responsibility and service. Such subjects are pressing into the curriculum as the psychology of religion, the principles of religious education, personal and public evangelism, home and foreign missions, Christian ethics, sociology, labor problems and the principles of Christian philanthropy. As a result, the curriculum of the more progressive seminaries is overcrowded, while there is considerable discontent with the position of those which still cling to the older subjects only. As yet, no fully satisfactory solution has been found for the problem thus created. In some institutions students are required to attend so many recitations per week that it is difficult for them to secure enough time to read and study in thorough, unhurried fashion; in others, under an elective system, the choice between competing courses is left so largely to the student that many neglect certain subjects, and fail to secure the fundamental, well-rounded training which the seminary should afford. A few seminaries have lengthened the course to four years, either by actual requirement, or as a matter of practice, in that many of the stronger students choose to remain for an additional year of post-graduate study.

The Institute of Social and Religious Research recently undertook a survey of the theological seminaries of the United States and Canada, the results of which were published in 1924 under the title "Theological Education in America." The most urgent need revealed by the facts thus brought together is the need for a thorough rethinking of the whole problem of theological education with a view to a reorganization of

the curricula of the seminaries. It seems probable that such a reorganization should be along lines determined by the various functions of ministerial service; and that the selection of materials for the curriculum should be with a view to their use and value in the fulfillment of these functions. There is doubtless a danger, in such functional reorganization, of conceiving the seminaries as mere training schools for certain activities—nothing but “priest-factories,” as one university professor irreverently put it—to the neglect of their function as schools which should educate men capable of thinking for themselves and of exercising intellectual leadership as well as moral and spiritual leadership in the communities which they serve. But with due care and proper insight this danger can be avoided. In the elementary and secondary schools, in the colleges and other professional schools, the growing wealth of knowledge and complexity of life have forced teachers to a reconsideration, in functional terms, of the educational value of the materials available for their curricula. Such reconsideration must take place whenever there are significant additions to the world’s store of knowledge and experience. In the fields which constitute the especial interest of the Church there has been remarkable growth of knowledge and experience throughout the past few generations. To deny the present need of a reconsideration and possible reorganization of the theological curriculum would be to deny the witness of the Spirit in the life of today.

At one point, especially, the theological seminaries have failed to avail themselves of principles of educational method which the experience of other schools has shown to be of great value. They fail generally to make adequate provisions for their students to learn by doing. It is true that most seminary students support themselves, in whole or in part, at least after the first year of their theological course, by serving as pastors of smaller churches in the vicinity of the seminary, teaching in church schools, or serving as Scout masters, leaders of boys’ clubs or residents in social settlements. Yet most seminaries fail to make an educational use of the activities in which students are thus engaged. These activities not only afford to students opportunities to use the truths which they learn from books, and to apply the principles discussed in the class room, but place them in situations within which problems arise which may quicken and motivate the whole of their theological education. It may indeed be possible to reorganize the curriculum, not only with a view to the functions which the young minister is in future to exercise, but with a view to the active functions which he is fulfilling while a student. Such a reorganization would give place in theological education to methods analogous to those of apprenticeship systems in industrial education, or the clinic and the hospital internship in medical education. A few seminaries, notably Union Theological Seminary in New York and the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, have begun to organize the field work of their students along these lines. There is room here for wise and

courageous experimentation. It would seem at least to be feasible in all seminaries to organize seminars of practice wherein students might discuss the problems arising in their field work under the leadership of their major professors.

It is perhaps not desirable that all theological seminaries should be of the same type. There are obvious advantages in the situation of the theological seminary in a large city, where its students can get a first-hand acquaintance with the problems of urban churches; but there are like advantages in the sequestered situation of other seminaries whose students can without distraction devote themselves to study, and can learn by serving as student pastors of rural parishes. There is much to be said in favor of the large seminary, which undertakes to train not only preachers and pastors, but missionaries for home and foreign fields, directors of religious education, social service workers, Y. M. C. A. officers, and teachers of religion in secondary schools, colleges and universities; but not all seminaries can be of this type, and there is much to be said also in favor of the smaller institution which centers its energies upon the training of preachers and pastors.

Without prejudice to their primary function as training schools for ministers, the theological seminaries of the United States have rendered great service to education through the multitude of their graduates who have taught in the schools and colleges. It was long a tradition that the presidents of American colleges should be clergymen; and it is yet true that many college presidents and professors, and head masters and teachers in secondary schools, have had a theological training. In one hundred years Yale Divinity School gave to America 112 college and university presidents and more than 500 members of college and university faculties, besides more than 3,000 ministers.

The seminaries occupy a position of strategic importance in the movement toward Christian unity and the cooperation of the churches. It depends upon them, humanly speaking, whether the ministers of the next generation will be jealous ecclesiastical partisans or men willing to enter into cooperative relations with brethren whose denominational heritage differs from their own. In spite of the present confusion of theological education, there are clear signs that the seminaries are moving in the direction of larger Christian fellowship rather than toward the further division and disintegration of Christian forces. Among these signs are:

the fact that a growing number of schools serve more than one denomination. The charter of Union Theological Seminary provides that "equal privileges of admission and instruction, with all the advantages of the institution, should be allowed to students of every denomination of Christians." Its student body in 1923-4 included members of 36 different denominations. A like universality of service characterizes most of the group of seminaries which are not controlled by a denomination; and even in certain denominational seminaries there is a small but growing number of students from other communions:

the fact, further, that many members of the theological faculties are men whose scholarship is recognized generally, rather than within the bounds merely of their own denomination. This has always been true of certain teachers of the Biblical languages and literature and of church history. It is true now as well, of many of the men who are developing the newer subjects of the seminary curriculum. Many professors of missions, of religious education, and of social service are recognized as authorities in their fields quite without regard to their particular denominational affiliation:

Another fact, associated with this, is the migration of students. The European custom whereby a student attends not one, but several universities, seeking the courses and the teachers of his choice, has never become rooted in American college and university life. The nearest approach to this custom is to be found in the theological seminaries today. Each year a certain number of theological students migrate from seminary to seminary in quest of work in special fields or with particular men. The proposal has been made that the seminaries might make better use of their resources by undertaking a degree of specialization. In that case not every seminary would attempt to maintain a strong mission department for example, or a department for the technical training of directors of religious education; and students would be encouraged to go for this work to those seminaries which are specializing in these fields:

the final fact looking in the direction of a larger Christian fellowship is the movement toward the affiliation of the seminaries with the universities. Some of the stronger seminaries are organic parts of a university, constituting its professional school of training for the Christian ministry on a parity with its professional schools of law and medicine. Other strong seminaries situated in the neighborhood of universities have entered into more or less close affiliation with them, and in some cases an exchange of credits is provided for. The number of courses thus thrown open to the seminary students is greatly increased, and a stimulating contact with the life of the larger institution is secured; while the seminary, in its turn, is able to contribute a valuable element to the university's program.

That research is one of the functions of a seminary is generally acknowledged. It is promoted not only by the work of individual professors, but by the establishment in some of the larger seminaries of graduate departments. The graduate schools of some of the universities, moreover, have departments of Religion, Religious Education, and Biblical Literature, and confer the degrees of M.A. and Ph.D. for meritorious work in these fields., which are closely related to the work of the seminary.

VI. The Church and Public Opinion

The Church's educational function is not limited to the young; it extends to the more mature. And it is concerned not only with individuals, but with the ideas, motives, and behavior of social groups.

Public opinion is more than a name for the collective opinions, independently formed, of individuals. The fact is that no individual is quite independent. The relation of the individual to the group is organic. The group is made up of individuals; but the individual's habits, beliefs and ideals are determined, in part, by the life of the groups of which he is a member. St. Paul recognized this fact; modern social psychology is discovering the laws of human nature which establish the truth of his conviction that we are members one of another.

In any social order, therefore, the Church will seek to educate men, not merely through direct teaching, but through the indirect influence of all those forces of the physical and social environment which have bearing upon the development of intelligence and character. If it were to rely upon direct teaching only, the Church would fail utterly to reach those who do not attend its worship or care for its ministries; and it would find itself blocked and hindered continually, in the case even of those who come directly under its influence, by the inertia and negative suggestions of pagan *mores* and non-Christian public opinion.

In a social order which possesses a political structure like that of the United States, it is especially important that the Church should conceive its educational function in the widest terms; and that it should make use of all legitimate methods to create and sustain an enlightened, effective and true public opinion upon all matters that lie within the range of its interest. The democratic organization of the American government is designed to make public opinion effective; and "in proportion," as Washington put it in the memorable words already quoted, "as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened." Moreover, the complete separation of Church and State in this country deprives the Church of all measures of coercion, renders it dependent upon its power to convince men who are quite free to dissent from its views or refuse its ministries, and confronts it with actual multitudes of folk who are indifferent to its appeal.

The agencies which determine public opinion are as wide and varied as the means of human communication, or even as the ways of human behavior. The chance allusions of oral speech and written correspondence have an effect far beyond their intention. The public press, the drama and motion picture, telegraph, telephone and radio, and the various forms of art and literature, have gained tremendously in power within the past few years. And there is always the silent influence of the *mores*—no less powerful today than in the simpler life of more primitive times.

The situation is greatly complicated by the fact that advertising has become not only an art, but a sort of science. The development of psychology has afforded a better understanding of the laws of human nature, and a larger control of the means whereby men are influenced. This has resulted, under pressure of war conditions, in the

current attribution of a new and somewhat sinister meaning to the word "propaganda," and in the wide prevalence of the sometimes blatant, sometimes insidious, but always one-sided assault upon the minds of men which we have come to associate with this term. And too generally it is assumed that the only way to meet propaganda is to organize counter-propaganda.

The Church undertakes to meet propaganda with the truth. The Church's sole interest in any public question is to learn the facts, and upon the basis of the facts, evaluated in the light of the principles of the Gospel of Christ, to discover the truth—for the truth alone can make men free.

The cessation of duelling and the abolition of public lotteries are instances of the creation of a new public opinion, for which the churches were largely responsible. With respect to slavery, the churches, unhappily, were divided; but they contributed greatly to the development of public opinion on both sides. The most significant example in American history of the slow, steady, permanent transformation of public opinion is with respect to the prohibition of the liquor traffic. Little more than a century ago, the drinking of liquor was a feature of all social occasions; at even the ordination of a minister, quantities of strong drink were consumed. The passage of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, whereby the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor is prohibited, is the result of a long process of education of the public mind in which the public schools, the Sunday schools, the churches, and business organizations had a share, as well as the temperance organizations which came into existence for the specific purpose of combatting the liquor evil. Without waiting for the amendment to the national Constitution, thirty-three states of the Union had adopted the policy of prohibition, and in other states so many counties and towns had voted to prohibit the liquor traffic as a matter of local option that before the amendment went into effect, 90 per cent. of the territory of the United States, containing 68 per cent. of the population, was legally dry, either by state or local enactment. It is significant that the tidal wave of public sentiment which brought about this result began twenty years after the movement in the late 80's, which made temperance instruction compulsory in the public schools of the various states. When the boys and girls to whom the public schools had taught the facts concerning alcohol grew to responsible manhood and womanhood, they resolved to put an end to its dominance.

The Church in America, as in other lands, faces a great many problems which can be solved only in the light of the principles of the Gospel of Christ, but with respect to which the precise application of these principles is not immediately clear—problems of economic justice and industrial welfare; problems arising out of the relations of the races; problems of personal and social morality, especially with respect to the relations of the sexes; problems touching the mutual bearings

of individual and corporate responsibility; problems of national policy and international relations. Where the relevant facts are clearly determined and known, with respect to any of these problems, it is the Church's duty to accept these facts, to interpret them in the light of Christian principles, to give clear public expression to its convictions, and to undertake definitely to contribute its share to the education of public opinion. Where the facts are not clearly known, and especially where there is distrust of the agencies, whereby public opinion is being determined, and reason to believe that the truth is being concealed or perverted, consciously or unconsciously, in the interest of a class, or for the purpose of propaganda, it is the Church's duty to do all that it can to learn the facts, to the point even of undertaking definite investigations, if it can stimulate no other responsible agency to do so. In the fulfillment of all such functions the Church must exercise the most scrupulous care to be no less thorough in investigation, catholic in spirit and single-minded in its search for and devotion to the truth than its high purpose demands. Too often those who speak in the name of religion have thrown themselves open to the reproach of inadequate knowledge, hasty generalization and doctrinaire deliverances.

The Church has no miraculous means of learning facts; the sincerity of its purpose will not prevent it from falling into error. It must, in its investigations, follow the rules of evidence which guide honest minds always and anywhere. It must not be prejudiced by its hopes or fears, likes or dislikes. But when the facts in any situation are discovered, the Church has a sure basis, in the principles of Jesus, for the interpretation of these facts and the determination of the truth. What judgment would He render? What, in the light of His principles and motives, ought we to do? What changes in these facts does the fulfillment of His purpose for the world demand? In thousands of American churches questions such as these, in their application to social, economic, and industrial facts, are being discussed not only by ministers in the pulpit, but by laymen and laywomen in adult classes, discussion groups, midweek meetings and men's clubs. A number of churches have adopted the Forum idea and invite speakers representing a wide range of interest and experience to present their views freely as a basis for subsequent discussion.

The Church most surely influences public opinion by living the truth while speaking the truth in love. Its appeals from pulpit and press accomplish little if they be not incarnate in the lives of those who profess the name of Christ. When preaching and practice conflict, it is practice that wins. In no way can pagan *mores* be so effectively transformed as by the leavening powers of Christian *mores*.

The Christian education of public opinion depends in part upon the local church, in part upon the organized effort of denominational societies and boards, and in part upon interdenominational cooperation. The world is beginning to see the possibilities of the last of these

methods. There was a time, not so long ago, when practically the whole task of educating public opinion upon the basis of Christian principles was left to the local church, with the assistance of religious books, tracts, and church papers. The growing complexity of the problems involved in the social, economic, and industrial order has led more recently to the organization, by most denominations, of Boards or Departments of Social Service, Public Morals, Temperance, Rural Welfare and the like. It is becoming increasingly clear that these denominational departments cannot render their full service to the churches which they represent, except by measures of cooperation which will, to some degree, pool their resources and make possible greater competence in research, more breadth of vision and depth of insight, and more prestige in relation to other forces that influence public opinion.

Such considerations as these have led the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America during recent years to give increasing attention to developing plans for expressing in a more commanding way the mind of the churches with reference to great public issues, in which Christian principles are at stake. A Department of Research and Education has been established, designed to serve the various churches as a common agency for securing the data which they all alike need, to make this material available for the use of all, and to secure a more united impact on the public mind. An Information Service is published every week, which presents careful analyses of contemporary social, industrial, economic and international problems. This service goes to a steadily enlarging list of subscribers among ministers, social workers, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. secretaries and laymen. It is also sent to the religious press, and its more important articles are often released to the daily press as well.

Two or three illustrations of the way in which the material thus brought together by the Department of Research is used may help to make clear the significance of this program of cooperation in influencing public opinion along certain lines. After the facts with regard to the continuance of the twelve-hour day in industry, especially in the manufacture of steel, had been carefully secured, a public statement was issued, setting forth the moral issues in such a clear light that it was published in almost every important newspaper in the country. The effect of this step was increased manifold by securing the joint action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Within a few weeks thereafter, the greatest steel organization in the world announced that, in response to the demand of public opinion, it was taking steps toward the abolition of the twelve-hour day.

A second illustration has to do with the problem of race relations in the United States, with especial reference to the lynching evil. During the past three years, the churches, through the Federal Council, have been carrying on a special effort against lynching. From 1885

until 1922, there had been an average of over one hundred lynchings per year in the United States. During the last two years, this number has fallen markedly, until in 1924 there were only sixteen lynchings. Into the producing of this result many other factors than the interest of the churches entered, but it is generally agreed that the contribution made by the churches was a significant one.

A third illustration concerns the efforts of the churches for the entrance of the United States into the World Court. As the culmination of a steady program of popular education on this subject, the Federal Council of the Churches presented its point of view in an extended hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, at which the official resolutions of the various denominations in the country were presented at the same time by their representatives.

In this way, and by similar conferences with the Department of State, the concern of the churches was expressed in a way which made it clear that the issue was one in which not simply small Christian groups, but practically the entire Christian forces of the country were involved.

What has been done is only a slight beginning in what needs to be done, but is sufficient to indicate possibilities of great Christian achievement when the churches definitely set themselves to work together in discovering the facts with regard to our social life and in holding them up to the light of Christian teaching.

The fact is that the greatest weakness of the Church with respect to the education of public opinion lies in its division into denominations and sects, each with a separate mind of its own. It is impossible for non-cooperating, even disagreeing churches to command the attention and respect of the public press, the theatres and motion picture shows, the chambers of commerce, and the various organizations of business men and workmen, to say nothing of the legislative and administrative officers of the State. If the Christian ideal of life is to be understood in these bewildering days, and is to be presented effectively and convincingly to the public, the churches must get together. They must think together that they may reach a common mind; and they must act together to express their common conviction. When this takes place, there need be no fear that the public press will refuse to cooperate with Christian forces, or that public places of amusement will fail to take account of the new temper of the public mind. For instance several daily papers in the United States have always insisted on telling the truth about plays that were being given at the cost of very lucrative advertising. Several theatres in New York for a year or so refused admittance to the dramatic editor of "Life", our leading humorous paper, because he insisted on telling the truth. At this writing there is a movement in New York City for banishing the salacious plays from the theatre and a jury selected from a panel of 300 citizens is being set up to censor any suspected play that may be on the stage. Without exception the daily papers have stood squarely behind this movement for a clean theatre. These

instances could be multiplied and they all point to the fact that the public press is willing to cooperate with the Christian forces whenever those forces bring any real united action against questionable amusements of any sort. The churches of America have made a good beginning at such cooperation, chiefly through the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; but they have a long way yet to go.

VII. The Church and International Education

"We are members one of another"—nations as well as individuals. Even the selfish can no longer doubt that. The past decade has revealed with arresting clearness the fact of the increasing interdependence of the human race under the conditions of modern communication and transportation, commerce and industry.

There stands revealed, too, the fact that the common enemy of all mankind is war. More terrible than the demons and principalities of darkness that our ancestors strove against, harder to conquer than the forces of nature itself, which have so largely yielded to man's understanding and control, now appears the devil that dwells within man himself, our human readiness to strike and to hate. For war, as the world is now equipped to conduct war, means the suicide of civilization.

War, it has well been said, is a state of mind. It results from habits of thinking and feeling, from attitudes of expectation and preparedness, when something happens to fire the resentment of a people. The way to prevent war, therefore, is to change these habits and attitudes. One of the surest ways to accomplish these results is by process of education and the Church has not only the opportunity but the obligation resting upon it to direct intelligently and effectively these processes.

The American School Peace League was organized in 1908 with the avowed purpose "to promote through the schools and the educational public of America the interests of international justice and fraternity." To emphasize more positively the constructive responsibilities of citizenship in view of the changed world situation, the name of this organization was changed in 1919 to the American School Citizenship League. Its aim was stated as three-fold: "To define the meaning of American citizenship; to stimulate the teaching of American citizenship in the schools of the United States; to cooperate with educational agencies in foreign countries for the promotion of international understanding through the simultaneous training of the coming generations of all nations to recognize the efficiency of peaceful agreements in regulating the constantly increasing relations among the States in the world."

In the furtherance of these aims the League has published a comprehensive, graded "Course in Citizenship and Patriotism", which emphasizes the constructive ideals of goodwill and cooperation. It undertakes to develop the spirit of these ideals from the first year of school life

through the widening relationships of the child, acting as a member of the home, school, town or city, state, nation, and finally as a member of the world family. The Secretary of the League reports that each year has registered a larger use of this book in the American public schools, and that the book has been sent to many organizations and individuals in Europe, Asia and South America in response to appeals for information on the teaching of citizenship and international relations.

The League has also published "An American Citizenship Course in United States History", which consists of a series of five books prepared for the elementary schools. The aim of this course, as stated by the Secretary of the League, is "to teach the social, economic, and political development of the nation, and to show the relations of these three lines of activities to similar lines of activities in other countries of the world. The Course leads pupils to make correct measurements of human values; to see that the problems of developing the resources of the United States, of extending industries, of developing education, and of working out the unique experiment of a federated nation have been solved by the representatives of different nations imbued with the American spirit of liberty and justice; to understand that the life of the Union has been intertwined with world movements, and that in the future our country is destined to play a larger part than before in the councils of world affairs; and to realize that the economic and moral welfare of our country is consistent with the welfare of humanity, and that this demands uninterrupted cooperation among the nations, and the reign of reason and justice founded upon international good-will."

The League has in view also the preparation of a course in geography which will recognize that the great aim in teaching geography should be to make peoples more intelligent about each other, and that through geography the social conditions and the national ideals of peoples should be taught. It has promoted the annual observance of Peace Day, now called International Goodwill Day, in the public schools. This day, which commemorates the opening of the first Hague Peace Conference, was appointed by the United States Commissioner of Education in 1906, as a day on which the children of America should, through suitable celebrations, be made conscious of their place in the international fellowship of the peoples of the world. The League has offered annual prizes for the best essays by members of the senior classes of the high schools and normal schools of the United States, upon subjects concerned with citizenship and international relations; and these contests have been thrown open, in recent years, to the students of all countries. It has undertaken to further mutual understanding by encouraging a system of correspondence whereby the school children of America write letters to children of their own age in other countries and receive letters from them.

The public schools of America are still far, however, from accomplishing all that they can and should accomplish toward the development of international goodwill. Admirable as is the work of the

American School Citizenship League, such an organization inevitably appears to children as a sort of extra-curriculum interest. More than this, there is needed a more effective motivation of the curriculum as a whole in the interest of world-brotherhood, and a reshaping of curriculum materials and methods with a view to the promotion of a truer understanding of the facts of history and a better appreciation of the kinship of the peoples and races.

Recent studies of the textbooks used in our schools show that many of these yet reflect those habits of thought and feeling which, in all generations, have fostered the disposition to resort to war. Textbooks of history generally devote too large a proportion of their space to politics, diplomacy and wars, even to the details of battles and campaigns, and too little to the constructive victories of peace. The result is that war is idealized, and that children get the impression that the years during which the nation was at peace were years of relative inactivity and stagnation. Some of these books tend to identify patriotism with mere national pride or with jingoism; and they slight, misconstrue or even treat unfairly the history of other nations. Textbooks in geography, again, dwell too exclusively upon physical conditions, political boundaries and commercial products, to the neglect of the life of the people who inhabit the lands; or if this is described, throw into too bold relief those differences in social custom which make people of another heritage than our own seem odd and queer.

There is danger, also, of propaganda in the schools. Every organization devoted to a cause is eager, naturally, to use the schools to further its purposes; and school boards and administrative officers must continually refuse to countenance some new propagandistic scheme. Militaristic organizations, however, so readily don the cloak of patriotism that it is often hard to draw the line between those elements of their program which deserve the recognition and cooperation of all patriotic citizens, and those elements which are unworthy because they tend to perpetuate the reign of force. Racial groups, moreover, and groups bound by sentiment to other nations, may seek recognition for the points of view which they represent, and thereby do injustice to other groups and interests. One such group has recently issued a document, demanding the discontinuance of the use in the public schools of certain textbooks in history, on the ground of their alleged distortion of facts in the interest of Anglo-American friendship.

Yet unquestionably the total trend of public education in America is toward increasing and more vital provision for the development, through the curriculum and life of the schools, of that type of citizenship which seeks to understand other peoples, to manifest good will toward them, and to cooperate with them where this is practicable. The best evidence is to be found in the attitude of the teachers. The National Education Association was deeply interested in the International Conference on Education, which was called, at the invitation of

the Government of the Netherlands, to meet at The Hague in September, 1914. When the outbreak of the World War prevented the meeting of this Conference, the Association voted that its annual meeting in 1915 should partake of the nature of an International Congress on Education. Invitations were duly transmitted to all governments having representatives accredited to the United States, and to the educational associations of these countries; and delegates were present from thirty nations. Again, in the summer of 1923, a World Conference on Education was held at San Francisco, attended by representatives from over fifty nations, most of whom were delegates from teachers' organizations. The purpose of the Conference, as stated in the call, was: "To afford opportunity for educators of the various nations to agree upon principles and plans for the promotion of good will and mutual understanding, which are universal in their application and which can be adopted as a definite program to be carried out in the schools throughout the world." This Conference resulted in the organization of a World Federation of National Education Associations. Its concluding resolution was: "Be it finally resolved: that the economic, social and intellectual welfare of humanity demands uninterrupted cooperation among the nations of the earth, and the reign of reason and justice founded upon international good-will; that such teaching will show the high significance of those things which enter into a true conception of civilization; and that the acceptance and promulgation of these ideals will form a sound foundation for the promotion of higher spiritual values in the schools of the world."

The development of world-friendship appears to be so natural and intrinsic a function of the church and the church school as to call for no discussion. The churches of Christ transcend and cut across national boundaries. They are the bearers of the evangel of peace on earth and good will among men. They are at liberty to accept without reservation Christ's principle of love. No organization of recent years, it would seem, is more natural or should be more effective, than the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches.

Yet, even in their own life, the churches have not realized the world-friendship toward which the spirit of the Master moves them. They have conceived their relations to the people of other nations in terms of foreign missions almost exclusively; and have too often conceived missions in terms analogous to conquest or colonization rather than in terms of Christian brotherhood. They have given men and money to convey the message of the Gospel to the inhabitants of other lands; and have sometimes failed to give, with men and money, the friendship of heart and will. So strange things come to pass, such as the holding in tutelage, on mission fields, of native churches which aspire to control their own affairs; the sending of rum and missionaries on the same ship to the same people; the insistence of nominally Christian governments upon their right to traffic in opium; the passing, without conference, of immigration laws which offer gratuitous insult

to a friendly nation. The churches are not directly responsible for many such things; but if they had better fulfilled their function as ambassadors of the gospel of world-brotherhood, perhaps business organizations and governments would better understand the application of Christian principles to our common life.

The development of the newer type of church school, described in an earlier section of this report, makes possible a richer and more effective program for the education of children in world-friendship. Under the older type of Sunday school organizations, little was done except to organize children into missionary societies or bands, whose activities lay quite outside of the regular series of lessons and were generally confined to the raising and giving of money to foreign missionary enterprises. Such a program conveyed little or no instruction, and even its activities were of little educational value. The present movement to organize church schools whose curriculum is pupil-centered, inclusive and founded upon activity, throughout the week days as well as on Sunday, makes it possible to afford to the experiences and enterprises of world-friendship and world-service their normal and proper place in the Christian education of children. The same materials and methods, in this field, are open to the church school as are open to the public school. While the public school has the advantage of possessing a much larger share of the child's time, the church school has the advantage of access to the full range of Christian facts and appeal to definitely Christian motives.

It is interesting to note that several denominations have introduced courses on international good will into their regular Sunday-School Quarterlies. In addition to this, special courses in international good will have been prepared by the Commission on International Justice and Good-will of the Federal Council of Churches, which have been widely use as *extra*-studies in Bible Classes and in Men's and Women's Study Groups. The various Foreign Missionary Boards have prepared courses in international good will which have been widely used by the local groups of the Missionary Societies. Fifteen years ago Dr. Josiah Strong, prepared a series of 52 lessons, one for each week in the year, on international peace, in which the whole subject was carefully surveyed and questions for discussion inserted. This was circulated by The Church Peace Union and widely used in the churches. A book of study courses on international good will has just been written by two professors in Dartmouth College for the use of study groups. At this writing the Commission on International Relationships of the National Congregational Council is preparing a course of study for the Congregational churches during the Lenten season. There are many other instances where these courses are being prepared, but these will suffice for illustration.

If Christian education is to make its full contribution to the development of world-friendship and international good will, the churches of

Christ throughout the various nations of the world must work together. The public-school teachers of the nations, we have seen, have found it desirable to organize a World Federation of National Education Associations. There is room and need for a similar international agency in the field of Christian education. Just what its form and organization should be, is a problem which this Conference may well consider. The present World's Sunday School Association is too narrow in scope. The International Missionary Council comes nearer, perhaps, to furnishing an analogue.

There are also eight or ten missionary magazines of a very high standard which are making an invaluable contribution to international goodwill through their interpretation of the peoples of other lands. The most outstanding of these magazines are as follows:

The Missionary Review of the World, The Missionary Herald, The Spirit of Missions, Missions, The Voice of Missions, The Missionary Survey, The World Call, The Moslem World, Women's Work.

There is no clearer call to Christian unity than that which comes from the childhood and youth of the world. We must not abandon our children to schemes of education that ignore religion. Can we honestly, in the name of Christ, educate them to perpetuate the over-emphases upon differences that have marred the life of His Church and delayed the coming of His Kingdom?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Single books which cover, in a general way, the ground of this report are:

- Brown, William A., *The Church in America*, New York, 1922.
- Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, *The Teaching Work of the Church*, New York, 1923.
- Bound proceedings of "The Religious Education Association."
- Bound proceedings of "The Christian Education."

The following books are grouped according to the sections of the report:

I. The Educational Function of the Christian Church

- Cope, Henry F., *Religious Education in the Church*, New York, 1918.
- Faunce, W. H. P., *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry*, New York, 1918

II. Public Education in the United States

- Brown, S. W., *The Secularization of American Education*, New York, 1912.
- Chapman, J. C. and Counts G. S., *The Principles of Education*, Boston, 1924.
- Cubberley, E. P., *Public Education in the United States*, Boston, 1919.
- Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education*, New York, 1916
- Dewey, John and Evelyn, *Schools of Tomorrow*, New York, 1916.
- Rugh and others, *Moral Training in the Public Schools*, New York, 1907.
- Rugh and others, *The Essential Place of Religion in Education*, Ann Arbor, 1916.

- III. The Present Status of the Church School in the United States**
Burns, J. A., *Catholic Education*, New York, 1917
Burns, J. A., *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States*, New York, 1912.
Betts, George H., *How to Teach Religion*, New York, 1919.
Betts, George H., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, New York, 1924.
Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, New York, 1917.
Cope, Henry F., *Religious Education in the Family*, Chicago, 1915
Cope, Henry F., *Organizing the Church School*, New York, 1923.
Cope, Henry F., *The Week Day Church School*, New York, 1921.
Cope, Henry F., *Weekday Religious Education: A Survey and Discussion of Activities and Problems*, New York, 1922.
Stout, J. E., *The Organization and Administration of Religious Education*, New York, 1922.
Thwing, Charles F., *The Family; an historical and social study*, Boston, 1913.
Weigle, L. A., *The Training of Children in the Christian Family*, Boston, 1922.
- IV. The Church and Higher Education**
Thwing, Charles F., *History of Higher Education in America*, New York, 1906.
Thwing, Charles F., *The American College: What it is and What it May Become*, New York, 1914.
Welch, Herbert, *The Christian College*, New York, 1916.
King, Henry C. *The Christian College*, New York, 1916.
Nicholson, Thos., *The Christian College*, New York, 1916.
Files of Christian Education and Religious Education.
- V. The Church Training Its Ministers**
Faculty of the Yale Divinity School, *Education for Christian Service*, New Haven, 1922.
Kelly, Robert L., *Theological Education in America*, New York, 1924.
- VI. The Church and Public Opinion**
Ellwood, C. A., *The Reconstruction of Religion*, New York, 1922.
Lippman, W., *Public Opinion*, New York, 1922.
McConnell, F. J., *The Preacher and the People*, New York, 1922.
- VII. The Church and International Education**
Cabot, Ella L. and others, *Course in Citizenship and Patriotism*, New York, 1918.
Lobingier, J. L., *World Friendship Through the Church School*, Chicago, 1923.

Printed in U. S. A.
THE GOTHIC PRESS
New York, N. Y.

METHODS OF COOPERATIVE
AND FEDERATIVE EFFORTS
BY THE
CHRISTIAN COMMUNIONS



American Section
Report of Commission VI

to

THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

HELD IN STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

August 19-30, 1925

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE
ON LIFE AND WORK

Commission Reports

- I. The Church's Obligation in View of
God's Purpose for the World.
- II. The Church and Economic and Industrial
Problems.
- III. The Church and Social and Moral Prob-
lems.
- IV. The Church and International Relations.
- V. The Church and Education.
- VI. Methods of Co-operative and Federative
Efforts By the Christian Communions.

GENERAL PREFACE

A few words should be written about the inception of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In the summer of 1919 the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches met at The Hague. This was the first meeting of an international character held after the signing of the Armistice, if one excepts a small gathering of labor leaders. About sixty leaders of the Churches were present, representing nearly all the Protestant Communions and most of the countries of Europe. Ten or twelve delegates were present from America.

The meetings at The Hague developed so sweet and reasonable an atmosphere, at a time when great bitterness prevailed everywhere, and the delegates present expressed themselves so strongly as to the un-Christian character of war and the necessity of establishing a world order on a new and Christian basis, that several of the delegates felt strongly that the time had come for the Churches officially to get together and say what these Churchmen semi-officially were saying. As a result Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden, Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of America, the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and others held an informal meeting to discuss the possibility of bringing the Churches of the world together for a Conference, where the Churches could utter their united conviction on international matters and all other matters with which society would have to deal in the reconstruction of civilization and the building of a new and better civilization on the ruins of the old, which lay all about them.

This preliminary meeting was not altogether spontaneous for on two separate occasions during the progress of the war, Archbishop Soederblom had communicated with the Churches of Europe and America regarding the possibility of such a conference and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America had suggested that a Conference of the Federated bodies of Churches in all the countries might meet together after the war. The unanimous opinion of the unofficial group at The Hague was that a committee should be appointed to bring the leaders of the Churches together with the aim of convincing them of the necessity of such a world gathering of the Churches, and asking them to take the matter up with their respective denominations. This committee went from The Hague to Paris and brought together as many of the leaders of the Churches as possible upon such short notice. This meeting became greatly interested in the project and requested Dr. Frederick Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenical Conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America to arrange for a preliminary meeting of the Churches the following summer.

Dr. Lynch proceeded from Paris to London and had several interviews with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F. B. Myers, Dr. Thomas Nightingale, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare and others. Meantime, Archbishop Soderbloom undertook to interest the Scandinavian Churches and Dr. Choisy

the Swiss Churches. Sufficient interest was aroused to warrant the calling of a preliminary Conference at Geneva in the summer of 1920.

As a result of the procedures recorded above, one hundred delegates assembled at Geneva in August of 1920. A three days session was held and the Conference gradually began to assume shape. Great interest was manifested and all present expressed themselves to the effect that the Church Universal had a great opportunity to exert a determining influence upon the new order that must follow the war. Furthermore the world was waiting for some great pronouncement from the Churches upon such questions as war and peace, the industrial order; such immediate problems as those having to do with intemperance and vice and upon all ethical and moral questions. It was felt that a positive and commanding utterance of the Churches in these trying years would do much to encourage a disheartened world and would make it much easier for those who were trying to reconstruct the world on a Christian basis to carry on this high task. There was much confusion in the world as to just where the Church did stand on these great problems disturbing the minds of men. The conviction was expressed that only as the rule of life laid down by the gospels became the law of nations could any hope for security and peace be found or the great sores of the world be healed.

Furthermore it was felt by all that whatever new international machinery might be set up or whatever new industrial order might arise, it was only as these were permeated by the spirit of Jesus Christ that they would fulfill the high hopes of their founders. It was also strongly felt that two great blessings might ensue from such a Conference. On the one hand all individual communions would profit by this period of common intercourse, especially those communions that had greatly suffered from the war. They would be made strong in the consciousness of the oneness of all Christ's disciples. On the other hand the coming together, if only for a month, of all the Churches of the world, to cooperate in the common task of redeeming the world order, and to make some great common pronouncement on the place of Christ in our civilization would be a great object lesson to the world.

At Geneva a large International Committee was set up which was divided into four groups, one for America, one for the British Empire, one for the European Protestant churches and the fourth representing the Orthodox Eastern Church. The International Committee appointed a smaller Executive Committee, which held three meetings in successive years, one at Peterborough, England, one at Zurich, Switzerland and one at Amsterdam, Holland. In August, 1922, the International Committee itself met at Helsingborg, Sweden, and was very fully attended by delegates from all the communions and nations. At this meeting the programme for the Conference assumed final shape. It was voted that the program for Stockholm should include the following groups of subjects:

1. The Church's Obligation in view of God's purpose for the world.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The reports which followed are in fulfillment of this vote taken at Helsingborg. In April, 1924, the full Committee met again at Birmingham, England, in connection with C. O. P. E. C. and reviewed the progress made upon the reports and dealt specifically with plans for the Stockholm meeting.

This is in brief the history of The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and is the explanation of the reports which follow. These reports have been prepared with great care by the leaders of the Churches and by experts in the several questions discussed. They are submitted to the Conference in the hope that the Conference will receive them in the same spirit in which they have been written, i.e. in the endeavor to find the common consciousness of the Churches upon these subjects and to voice its united feeling.

LIST OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chairman

ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D.
Secretary of Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.

Secretaries

REV. ROY B. GUILD, D.D.
Executive Secretary of Commission on Councils of Churches, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

REV. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND, D.D.
General Secretary of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Members

AINSLIE, REV. PETER, D.D.
President of Association for Promotion of Christian Unity.

ALLEN, MRS. JOHN S.
Corresponding Secretary of Women's Board of Domestic Missions, Reformed Church in America.

BARBOUR, PRESIDENT CLARENCE A., D.D.
President of Rochester Theological Seminary.

BULLA, REV. CHARLES D., D.D.
Representative of the General Sunday School Board in the Los Angeles District of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

CANNON, BISHOP JAMES, Jr., D.D.
Chairman of Commission on Temperance and Social Service of Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

CAVERT, REV. SAMUEL McCREA
General Secretary of Federal Council of the Churches in America.

CLARK, MISS ELIZABETH
Associate Executive of the Foreign-Born Department, Y.W.C.A. of the United States.

COLTON, E. T.
Associate General Secretary of International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations.

EMHARDT, REV. WM. CHAUNCEY, PH.D.
Field Director, Foreign Born Americans, Protestant Episcopal Church.

EVANS, THOMAS S.
Secretary of International Association of Daily Vacation Bible Schools.

FRANKLIN, REV. JAMES H., D.D.
Foreign Secretary of American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.

GANDIER, PRINCIPAL ALFRED
Principal of Knox College in Toronto, Canada.

GATES, EDWARD P.
General Secretary of United Society of Christian Endeavor.

GOODRICH, REV. CHAUNCEY W., D.D.
American Representative of Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe.

HARBAUGH, MRS. F. L.

- HYDE, A. A.
President of Mentholatum Co.
- INMAN, DR. SAMUEL G.
Executive Secretary of American Section of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America.
- KELLY, DR. ROBERT L.
Executive Secretary of Council of Church Boards of Education.
- KNUBEL, REV. FREDERICK H., D.D.
President of the United Lutheran Church in America.
- LANDES, DR. W. G.
Secretary World's Sunday School Association.
- MANN, FRANK H.
General Secretary of American Bible Society.
- MARTIN, PRESIDENT WILLIAM J.
President of Davidson College.
- MILLAR, DR. WILLIAM B.
General Secretary of the New York Federation of Churches.
- MILLER, REV. RUFUS W., D.D.
Secretary of Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church.
- MONTGOMERY, REV. GEORGE R., PH.D.
Associate Secretary of Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- MOORE, REV. JOHN M., D.D.
Chairman, Administrative Committee, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- NICHOLSON, BISHOP THOMAS
Resident Bishop, Detroit Area of the Methodist Episcopal Church.
- NORTH, REV. FRANK MASON, D.D.
Secretary-Counsel of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church.
- PEARSON, REV. MORTON C.
Executive Secretary of The Detroit Council of Churches.
- ROOT, REV. E. TALLMADGE
Executive Secretary of The Massachusetts Federation of Churches.
- SMITH, FRED B.
Chairman, Commission on Councils of Churches of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- STONEHAM, MRS. ELBRIDGE
Y.W.C.A., Portland, Maine.
- THOMAS, REV. ERNEST, D.D.
Field Secretary, Evangelism and Social Service, The Methodist Church in Canada.
- THOMPSON, REV. CHARLES L., D.D.
Secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church.
- TURNER, FENNELL P.
Secretary Foreign Missions Conference of North America.
- VANCE, REV. JOSEPH A., D.D.
President National Board of Missions of Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.
- WILDER, ROBERT P.
General Secretary of Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions.
- WRIGHT, REV. EDWIN R.
Executive Secretary of The Federated Churches in Cleveland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. Achievements and Lessons in American Experience	2
1. In the Local Field.	
2. In the National Field.	
(a) In the United States.	
(b) In Canada.	
II. Achievements and Lessons in Cooperation in Other Lands	10
(a) The Orient.	
(b) In Latin American Countries.	
III. Achievements in Cooperation of the Western and Eastern Churches	13
IV. Achievements and Lessons in International Cooperation	15
1. International Associations of the Denominations.	
2. International Missionary Council.	
3. International Relations of Federations.	
4. International Relations Through the World Alliance for Inter- national Friendship.	
5. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work.	
V. Principles Which Should Govern the Further Development of Co- operation	18
VI. Advanced Steps Now Called For	20
A Brief Bibliography	22

METHODS OF COOPERATIVE AND FEDERATIVE EFFORTS BY THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNIONS

Other reports presented to the Conference have considered various phases in the Church's responsibility in the world. Evangelism and missions, religious education, social service, the Christianizing of our international life—these and other tasks of the Church have been studied. But all these important questions force us back to a still deeper question, the answer to which conditions success in every field. It is the question of the nature and constitution of the Church itself. What kind of a Church must we have in order to deal most effectively with the great problems with which modern civilization confronts us? Can isolated denominations, functioning independently of each other, speak with a voice that will command the world's attention? Can they, without some carefully planned consolidation of their influence, successfully oppose the massed forces of skepticism, selfishness and evil? Can separated churches bear a clear enough testimony to their essential unity of conviction, purpose and spirit, to lead the world to Christ as the one Lord and Saviour?

That the Christian churches throughout the world already possess an underlying spiritual unity, derived from their loyalty to a common Lord, we are profoundly convinced. We do not so much need to create unity as to recognize the inner unity that is here. Our main problem is to find the way of *expressing in voice and action* the essential oneness that is already ours.

That substantial progress has already been made in America in developing the needed agencies for such united action we believe the following pages will show. This progress centers not around a plan of organic union, on the basis of complete agreement as to doctrine and polity, but around the cooperation of the evangelical denominations in programs of practical Christian service. Without interfering in any way with the authority or autonomy of the several denominations in matters of creed or organization, a process of federation for the more effective performance of common tasks has been at work that is both ministering to the spirit of unity and making the Church a more powerful force in the national life. What has been done is only a modest beginning, but it clearly demonstrates the practicability not only of larger cooperation among the Christian forces of our own land but also of a cooperation transcending all boundaries of nation and race.

The modern world has so clearly become a single neighborhood, with even the remotest sections brought near to each other, that Christian cooperation can no longer be thought of as a national problem alone. In a world that has become one through economic and social interdependence, the Christian Church must in some way be able to think and act as one. Moreover, the Church must always be, by virtue of its very nature, a supra-national body, the fellowship of all men everywhere who

are bound together by their faith in one God as their Father and by their loyalty to the same Divine Lord and Saviour. In the words of an unknown writer of the Second Century:

"What the soul is in the body, that are Christians in the world. For the soul holds the body together and Christians hold the world together. This illustrious position has been assigned to them of God, which it were unlawful for them ever to forsake."

We shall give especial consideration, therefore, to the question as to how far the Church today is in a position to fulfill this fundamental Christian ideal.

The development of cooperation among the Christian churches we shall consider under the following six heads:

- I. Achievements and Lessons in American Experience.
- II. Achievements and Lessons in Cooperation in Other Lands.
- III. Achievements in Cooperation of the Western and Eastern Churches.
- IV. Achievements and Lessons in International Cooperation.
- V. Principles which should Govern the Further Development of Cooperation.
- VI. Advanced Steps Now Called For.

I. ACHIEVEMENTS AND LESSONS IN AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

1. In the Local Field

The cooperation of churches as churches in American communities has grown out of the earlier cooperation of church members as individuals. Individual Christians, recognizing some need of the community not supplied by the unrelated and sometimes rival churches, banded themselves together to meet this need. Among the foremost illustrations were the united efforts for deepening the evangelistic and spiritual life, under the far-reaching leadership of men like Dwight L. Moody, a generation ago. Many of our present-day organizations, like the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Young Men's Christian Association, and various philanthropic and reform organizations which receive their inspiration and their resources from the churches, also had their genesis in the coming together of individuals from various churches in the interest of some common task.

The growth of the sense of responsibility for the whole community on the part of the churches, the recognition of the fact that many important tasks could only be met by combined efforts, the success and the fellowship resulting from occasional cooperation of the laymen and clergymen of different churches, gradually led to a definite conviction of the cardinal importance of developing systematic *cooperation among the churches themselves in their organized capacity*. Instead of continuing to do the work of the churches without official authority or support,

those who were interested in cooperation began to work out plans by which they could have the clear sanction, guidance and support of the churches. This has been accomplished in many a community, chiefly during the last fifteen years, by the formation of a cooperative body, usually called a "Council of Churches" or "Federation of Churches." Needless to say, the development of this cooperative movement has been beset with many obstacles, due to the indifference or misunderstanding or prejudice among church people, but it is now clear that the first experimental stage has been successfully passed.

The Council of Churches is a central body whose members are elected by the churches themselves. The local church is the unit of authority. Each church may elect the pastor and two or more lay delegates, the number depending on the size of the church. These delegates constitute the Assembly of the Council (or Federation) of Churches. In a few of the larger cities, the unit that elects the delegates is not the single congregation but the ecclesiastical body composed of the churches of each denomination in that area, as the presbytery or classis or association or district.

An executive committee elected by the Council directs the united work from month to month. In the large cities, central headquarters are established and an executive is employed, the budget being provided by appropriations from the constituent churches, supplemented by gifts of individuals. The headquarters is the clearing house for the Protestant churches of the city and, to a certain extent, for other community organizations with which cooperation is desired.

At present forty-five cities in the United States have employed executives for cooperative work. There are many other cities in which the Councils of Churches depend upon volunteer leadership entirely. The work of such Councils, of course, is confronted with greater difficulties. In a number of cities of less than 100,000 population the Y. M. C. A., through its employed leadership, has rendered valuable service to the Council of Churches.

Several cities have had more than ten years of successful cooperative experience in these Church Councils. The programs have now become large and varied, and have in most cases been worked out in close cooperation with the Federal Council of the Churches, as the national interdenominational organization, which helps to organize them and to promote their interests. The following brief statement indicates what experience has been proved to be the main cooperative tasks to be carried on by a Council of Churches in a community:

- (a) An established center for the Protestant forces of the city is maintained, and a bureau of information on religious, social and civic affairs for use of pulpit, press, church and community workers.
- (b) Evangelism, the recruiting of the membership of the churches, is made more effective through a plan of simultaneous efforts. Primary dependence is placed on the pastors and officers of the

churches through their year-round work, rather than upon spectacular speakers from the outside. There is enough simultaneity to stimulate all, to reach those that might not be reached otherwise, but not of a character to lessen the responsibility of each congregation.

- (c) Religious education is promoted by teacher-training institutes for workers of all denominations, by Daily Vacation Bible Schools and by week-day religious education, the time for the latter being taken out of the public school schedule.
- (d) A ministry to unfortunate victims of unsocial and unchristian conditions is carried on in hospitals, infirmaries, reform schools, prisons and other charitable and penal institutions, many of which would otherwise receive little or no attention.
- (e) New churches are located and old churches relocated in accordance with a comity agreement, so that they are erected where they can be of most service to the city and where there will be less duplication of effort. The decision of the Council in all such matters is advisory only, but its recommendations are usually followed.
- (f) The churches' influence on the social life of the community is multiplied manifold by their united action. Law violation is lessened by creating Christian public opinion and giving moral support to public officials in the fulfillment of their duty. Helpful influences are brought to bear on industrial life through conferences of employers and employees with ministers of all denominations on the application of Christian principles to industry. Race relations are made more brotherly by securing the cooperation of the Christian leadership of the various races. Interest is awakened in world peace by public meetings and by messages to the Government expressing the united convictions of the churches.
- (g) Religious publicity is made more powerful because the Council of Churches speaks for all the churches in the interest of the whole community. A desire for religious news has been created so that many daily papers on their own initiative seek to render service to the churches.

Not only in the local community but also in the larger areas of several of the States that comprise the United States has interchurch cooperation been developed. The principles of organization and aims of the State Councils of Churches are similar to those of local federations above described. Their special significance may be summarized as follows:

1. The States are the foundation of the American system of federal government. To exert their full influence for Christian ideals in legislation and public life, the churches are finding that they must be able to act as a unit throughout the whole state.

2. The denominational conferences, synods, dioceses, etc., generally follow state boundaries. Councils consisting of their official delegates

possess an ecclesiastical significance and an influence which local congregations cannot give. This is especially helpful in comity adjustments to prevent and remove overlapping of churches.

3. The State Federation, including every church, rural as well as urban, isolated as well as grouped, can deal with the distinctive problems of the rural church. Local cooperation can be systematically promoted; and for the smaller communities, in which it is not possible to employ an executive, the State Federation office furnishes a clearing house of experience and expert advice.

Some of the policies which have resulted from the experience of ten years of working for cooperation in city and in state are as follows:

- (a) Local autonomy prevails in the organization. The churches of each community determine the form of organization, the personnel, the financial policy and the program of work.
- (b) The churches give to the Council authority to secure funds for the work and usually contribute to it, but the Council cannot assess the churches. All gifts are voluntary.
- (c) The churches give to the Council authority to undertake work that is a matter of concern to all, but the Council has no authority over any church in the Council.
- (d) The Council of Churches is not in reality another organization, but the coordination of the Christian forces of the city or state.

2. In the National Field

A. In the United States

In the national field, as in the local community, two types of cooperative organizations have developed. The older form, represented by such agencies as the Evangelical Alliance and the American Bible Society, seeks to unify Christian activity by bringing together persons who belong to various denominations, but who do not officially represent the denominations from which they come. Some sort of official approval however, from the church leaders, is commonly obtained. Such an organization may be called undenominational. The Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations are of this type in that they are free from ecclesiastical control, although the boards of management of both their national and their local organizations have a large lay constituency drawn from all evangelical denominations. Another significant illustration is the Student Volunteer Movement, which, while an independent organization, functions as a recruiting agency for all the Protestant foreign missionary boards in America.

The second or more strictly interdenominational type, is represented by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which was created in 1908 by the denominations themselves after several years of discussion, and the governing bodies of which are appointed directly by the constituent denominations. The national assemblies, conferences or conventions of twenty-six denominations have each

taken official action, approving the Constitution of the Council. In addition, the United Lutheran Church is a "consultative member," and the Protestant Episcopal Church cooperates through its Department of Christian Social Service.

The preamble to the Constitution declares that the Council is formed in order "more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian churches of America, in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour." Its basis, accordingly, is distinctly evangelical and all the constituent denominations belong to the evangelical group.

The Council, to quote the Constitution again, "has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or of worship," all these rights continuing, as formerly, to be the responsibility of each denomination. The Council cannot limit the autonomy of any of the constituent bodies in any way. Its purpose is rather to carry on such activities as the denominations are ready to carry on through a co-operative agency. Its program and policies are determined by the quadrennial sessions of the Council as a whole, the annual meetings of the Executive Committee and the monthly meetings of the Administrative Committee, the members of all of which are officially named by the constituent denominations.

The purposes of the American Federal Council are clearly in line with the spirit and interests of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. The Constitution of the Council defines its objects to be: "to express the fellowship and Catholic unity of the Christian Church" and "to secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life."

Other illustrations of a strictly interdenominational type of organization in the United States are the several Councils of Home and Foreign Missions and of Educational Boards, whose control is under committees created by the Boards of the various denominations, and which provide for conference, study and activity in their specialized fields. These "inter-board" agencies (as they may more accurately be called) include the following, the name in each case suggesting its sphere of interest: The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Home Missions Council, the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions, The Council of Women for Home Missions, the International Council of Religious Education, the Council of Church Boards of Education. These various agencies are related to the Federal Council of the Churches by being represented on its Administrative Committee, with a view to preventing friction or duplication of effort.

The chief purpose of the "inter-board" agencies is not to bring the denominations themselves into closer cooperation and fellowship, but to furnish needed central agencies for dealing with administrative problems of common concern. The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the oldest of these organizations, may be taken as an illustra-

tion of their character and service. Beginning in 1893 as an unappointed body of officers of the mission boards of the United States and Canada, it became in 1901 officially representative of the boards. In 1907 it had developed to the point of creating a standing committee known as the Committee of Reference and Counsel. It has since carried on many extensive studies and investigations of great value to all the boards, functioned for the boards in necessary approaches to governments in matters affecting missionary work, provided for the discussion of the more important issues in missionary administration and stimulated the spirit of cooperation, both among the boards at home and the agencies on the foreign field.

The Home Missions Council, organized in 1907, has, through standing committees and an annual meeting, prompted co-operative thought, study and planning in most of the distinctive features of home mission work. It is—in affiliated action with the Council of Women for Home Missions—composed of the national administrators of sixty-three boards of twenty-one denominations. Deputations sent to confer with the executives of missionary work in Western States have initiated state-wide joint studies of neglected fields. As one result, the responsible regional administrators in seven Northwestern States have definitely organized for “every-community service.” Areas are allocated. Duplication of effort is being eliminated. Concerted advance is the keynote.

The development of the interdenominational movement in the United States has taken place, in the main, during the last twenty years. It ought not to be forgotten, however, that as much as a century ago there was a period of interdenominational emphasis that later subsided. The “plan of union” between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists in the occupation of new territory in the West was a conspicuous illustration. More recently the Interchurch World Movement, organized in 1918 for the purpose of attempting rapidly a large immediate task, disbanded in 1920, partly as a result of not being able to secure support for an undertaking of such ambitious proportions, partly as a result of not giving adequate attention to other fundamental considerations.

The Federal Council of the Churches and the interdenominational organizations of the missionary and educational agencies, which have had a slower, steadier and more constructive growth, have had their ups-and-downs and still have to contend with a great body of indifference, lack of proper support and even distrust, but there is general agreement that gratifying progress has been made. A survey of the work being done by the Federal Council today—in evangelism, Christian education, social service, temperance, working for better relations between the races and for international justice and goodwill, and in many other realms—indicates how wide a range of important activities is now being carried on cooperatively by the churches through the Council. The development of cooperation among the churches of local communities throughout the country, along lines indicated in the preceding section, has also been largely due to the work of the Federal Council.

In favor of independent, undenominational organization, one may record the following advantages:

- (a) Larger freedom of action, permitting more extensive undertakings and quicker response to emergency needs.
- (b) The development of an individual constituency of persons not interested in ecclesiastical organizations or procedure, but concerned deeply for the accomplishment of some specific task.

The interdenominational organization, under definite official control by the associated denominations, on the other hand, especially commends itself for the reason that it has a direct influence upon the spirit and attitude of the churches or church boards toward one another and toward their common tasks, bringing home to them their responsibility as churches for united action. The fact that the more recent cooperative organizations have been created on this basis seems to indicate a trend toward denominational direction, and the existence of a substantial background of interdenominational opinion and interest. The evidence of such a tendency is seen further in the increasing desire of independent agencies to secure denominational approval and consent, and otherwise to establish contacts with the church bodies.

The problem of securing effective moral and financial support is one that perplexes most of these cooperative endeavors, due partly to a failure on the part of the churches to appreciate their responsibility for what too many are still pleased to call "outside causes," and partly to the recent aggressive forward movements of the denominations which have pretty fully exhausted present available resources.

Undenominational agencies naturally depend chiefly on individual gifts, though some of them seek denominational support on the basis of the service they render to the churches. Interdenominational agencies are generally supported in whole or in large part by denominational contributions, and they consider this the ideal way. It is found that increase in denominational support is commonly accompanied by an increasing sense of responsibility for control and direction.

Differences of opinion naturally develop as to the extent to which cooperation should be carried. There are those who would make cooperative work largely consultative and suggestive, leaving to the denominational bodies well-nigh exclusive responsibility for actual missionary, educational, or other work. A growing body of opinion, however, regards the field of cooperation as practically unlimited, and would favor the acceptance by cooperative bodies, as rapidly as practicable, of all tasks which can be more effectively accomplished through cooperative endeavor. The answer to this question must no doubt be left to the processes of life and more extended experimentation.

Other problems that have developed in the cooperative movement may be summed up briefly as follows:

Cleavages of theological opinion and personal temperament.

The question of a more equitable place for women in the management of agencies in which they are equally involved.

Tendency of cooperative bodies to advance more rapidly than the constituent units will follow.

Centering of control in too small a group.

Indifference of constituent bodies.

Over against all these problems, difficulties and weaknesses, American experience in the Federal Council of the Churches and the inter-board agencies, has demonstrated the practicability of cooperation, has succeeded measurably in discovering the principles of effective cooperation, and is finding a growing public opinion in the churches in its favor.

B. In Canada

Cooperation in church work in Canada has taken two general forms. The first is seen in the program of Social Service. In the management and support of Rescue Homes for delinquent or wayward girls and women there has been joint action by two or more churches. Practically all the work of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches in this field is so organized. Evangelistic work also has been promoted by united action between the boards of the two denominations. In anti-alcoholic education and propaganda, in which the field of cooperation is wider, each church board has its own staff, which however, is more or less at the disposal of the joint board in special campaigns.

Twenty years ago the churches formed what is known as the Social Service Council of Canada, which is a federal board composed of units from the national boards of each denomination and financed by grants from the denominational units. This Council focusses the effort and organizes the influence of all the churches in cases where approach to the legislature of the Dominion or of the Provinces may be desirable and the whole program has worked out very satisfactorily, the only difficulty being the tendency to develop a more expensive program than the denominational units are ready to carry.

The plan of cooperation now in force among the several theological colleges in Montreal, in accordance with which most of the instruction is given in common, and the School of Missions in Toronto, maintained jointly by the missionary forces, are other striking illustrations of a growing interdenominational spirit and practice.

In the field of religious education there is a definitely federal scheme. The old Provincial Sunday School Associations have nearly all vanished. Instead there is the Provincial Religious Education Council which really unites the various denominational boards of religious education in co-operative effort, the Council being financed by grants from the denominational boards. The Council is moving in the direction of doing less independent work and becoming increasingly the office through which joint efforts are put forth by the boards themselves.

In the program of home missions, an arrangement has been worked out by the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches, by which in sparsely settled communities where self-supporting churches are impossible, if carried on competitively, there will be only one church in a community. For more than twenty years this cooperation in the

effort to provide each community with religious ordinances and an evangelical ministry has been developing. The union of these three denominations into one Church has been finally ratified by each of them and by the Federal Parliament of Canada, and before the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work is held, the United Church of Canada will have become a fact. The Act of Incorporation makes provision that congregations not desiring to enter the Union may, by a majority vote of their members, decline to do so, retaining their congregational property and receiving through a commission an equitable share of the denominational property. There is a small minority in one of these communions strongly opposed to the Union and it seems likely that they will take advantage of the above provision and, for a time at least, continue an independent existence.

In many communities local union has definitely anticipated the union of the churches. Instead of an arrangement providing for a single denominational church, either Presbyterian or Methodist or Congregational, in the community, a congregation has been organized under the proposed constitution of the United Church of Canada. The extent to which this type of cooperation and local union had been carried may be estimated from the fact that before the United Church of Canada came into being on June 10th, 1925, at least 3700 congregations had entered upon the new order.

The experience of Canada, as of the United States, shows interdenominational cooperation to be both imperative and practicable; and while it is too soon to estimate the results of the great experiment Canada is making in the union of three great churches having diverse historical origin, it is certain the looking forward to this union has made possible a much larger measure of local cooperation, and it is generally agreed that from this forward step there will be no turning back.

II. ACHIEVEMENTS AND LESSONS IN COOPERATION IN OTHER LANDS

A. The Orient

In no phase of the Church's work have there been greater incentives to cooperation than in foreign missions. In proportion as the Church has come to appreciate its missionary task, it has become conscious of an underlying unity. The divisions of western Christianity are largely meaningless to Christians of the East. When one finds oneself not among Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians and Lutherans, but among Buddhists, Mohammedans or Animists the difference between Christian denominations seems slight. In the light of Christianity as a whole, set over against the non-Christian faiths, the essential oneness of the various Christian bodies is more clear. It is, therefore, no occasion for surprise that there has been a strong development of cooperation in most of the foreign fields.

In higher educational work it has become the policy of most of the leading missionary societies to develop union institutions. In China alone, for example, there are more than a score of educational enterprises under interdenominational control, including the five union universities in Peking, Nanking, Tsinan-fu, Chengtu and Foochow. The Christian colleges for women, such as those in Lucknow, Nanking, Peking, Madras and Tokyo, are other notable illustrations. Even in theological education, interdenominational management has been found practicable, as is witnessed to by such seminaries and training-schools as those at Bangalore, Seoul, Manila, Nanking, Canton and others.

In medical work many instances of union efforts can also be given. The Severance Medical College and Hospital in Seoul is the center for practically all the missions in Southern Korea. The medical school for women at Vellore, South India, is jointly supported and controlled by no fewer than twelve British and American societies. In literary work the Christian Literature Societies of Japan and China and the Bible Societies, not official bodies directly representing the Churches but functioning acceptably for all of them, are other significant examples of the possibilities of cooperation in all fields.

Division of territory is an expedient which has been not infrequently adopted to prevent needless competition in missionary developments. In the Philippines, distinct fields have been assigned to several denominations. In parts of China, India, Korea, Madagascar and other countries similar plans, in varying degrees, have been put into operation.

In several countries, comprehensive agencies for furthering missionary cooperation, conferences and comity throughout the nation have come into being. Especially has this been so since the epoch-making World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. In India, a National Missionary Council and Provincial Councils were established. In Japan there arose two important cooperative bodies, the Conference of Federated Missions and the Federation of Japanese Churches, comprising four-fifths of the Protestant Christians of Japan. These two are now superseded by the National Christian Council of Japan. In China the Continuation Committee, composed of individuals from the various missions, has now given place to the National Christian Council of China, as the outcome of ten years of experience culminating in the Shanghai Conference of 1922, and represents both the indigenous churches and the missions of nearly all Protestant denominations in a most significant program of common work.

In certain parts of the foreign field, the movement toward cooperation and unity has gone as far as actual organic union of the indigenous churches. In Japan, all branches of Methodism constitute a single Church. So also do the Japanese Christians of six Presbyterian and Reformed communions. The Canadian, English and American branches of the Anglican Church co-operate in China and Japan; the Canadian and English branches cooperate in India. In India the Lutherans are united. These cases illustrate only the union of separated branches

of the same general denominational family, but there are a few illustrations that cover wider ground. In South Fukien, for example, Chinese Christians from Congregational, Presbyterian and Reformed Missions, now constitute a single Church. The South India, United Church formed in 1908, includes the missionaries and Indian Christians of the American and the British Congregationalists, the Reformed Church of America and the United Free Church (Presbyterian) of Scotland.

B. In Latin American Countries.

Cooperative efforts in missions in Latin America are not of long standing. In 1913 a small committee was formed by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America to consider certain phases of the question. This grew into the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America. That Committee immediately began the preparation for the Panama Congress, at which there were representatives from more than fifty different organizations interested in the spiritual life of Latin America. Seven regional conferences were held in the important centers of Latin America immediately following the Congress and aided in outlining a comprehensive program for the whole field. Combined Christian forces found in these twenty nations a people united by a similar language, history, government, social structure and ideals, making possible a joint program for this continent and a half.

The Committee on Cooperation in Latin America acts as a clearing house for thirty different mission boards having work in Latin America. The Committee has always been officially representative of the mission boards themselves. Its functions are "consultative and advisory, not legislative and mandatory."

The Committee brings the mission boards around a common council table to discuss all their problems in Latin American work. It keeps a constant circle of helpful contacts and goodwill going through the mission boards. It pushes cooperative enterprises which would otherwise languish. It maintains helpful and broadening contacts with missionaries on the field. It makes for economy by doing for all of the boards work which individual boards would otherwise have to undertake. It represents the Evangelical Churches in many Pan-American movements which might otherwise overlook the importance of the Christian forces. It gives out a large amount of information to the press, schools, business concerns, and individuals concerning Latin America, keeping missionary work in these countries in the public mind. It arranges addresses and conducts classes on Latin American topics in churches, conferences, conventions and educational institutions. It is developing an ever widening acquaintance with the intellectual leaders in Latin America and undertakes to interpret to them the spirit and purpose of American Christianity.

There is now a general understanding between the various denominations concerning responsibility for certain assigned territories. The allocation of fields in Mexico is a notable example. There are regional Committees on Cooperation in each country. As in the Orient, so also

in Latin America, there are a large number of union presses and book stores, union theological seminaries and other union enterprises. In Santo Domingo a unique experiment in the whole missionary program has been begun. Instead of being satisfied with territorial allocations or certain union institutions, the boards interested in this field have formed a central agency by which the entire Christian enterprise on the island is to be developed and directed.

The principles of frank conference on all questions of general interest, of increasing cooperation in concrete programs and of official denominational representation in all cooperative enterprises, may be regarded as definitely established on the mission fields of both Asia and Latin America.

III. ACHIEVEMENTS IN COOPERATION OF THE WESTERN AND EASTERN CHURCHES

A matter requiring special attention is the development of closer relations between our Western Churches and the Eastern Churches.

The Anglican Church and the Episcopal Church in the United States have been in touch for many years with individual leaders in the Eastern Churches. The Anglican and Eastern Association has taken as its special work the development of union between the Episcopal Churches of the West and the Eastern Churches. Only in recent years, however, have direct contacts been made between the general group of Western Churches and Eastern Churches.

In recognition of the new opportunities for mutual helpfulness, the Patriarchate of Constantinople has appointed a Special Committee on Relations with Other Churches. It is the expressed purpose of this Committee to maintain regular correspondence with our Western Churches on questions interesting our common Christendom. The Eastern Churches through their regular representatives stationed in America to watch over their communicants, and through special representatives and correspondents have given expression to the great unity in our underlying faith.

The work of the Young Men's Christian Association of North America has been a very important factor in this development of more cordial relations. In 1890 it established the Mayak (Lighthouse) in Petrograd. The membership was almost entirely Orthodox and Orthodox priests served freely. During the World War the Association ministered so acceptably to the Russian prisoners that when Patriarch Tikhon in 1918 was asked about the classes for Christian training in these camps, his answer was, "the more the better." Throughout Greece, the Balkans and the Near East the major portion of the membership, the staff and the moral and spiritual support of the Associations is Orthodox and with rare exceptions they are actively encouraged by the highest Church authorities.

The Young Women's Christian Association in the last few years has opened centers in Constantinople, Bucharest, Riga and Revel. In all of these centers there is cooperation on the part of the Orthodox leaders.

The World's Student Christian Federation, of which the Student Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. are integral parts, has lately developed its organizations and service in the lands of the Eastern Churches, with full fellowship and cooperation between Eastern and Western Christians, without essential modification of its program of conferences, Bible study and evangelism.

There have also been friendly contacts of an important character developing through the various Foreign Mission Boards operating in the Near East, Near East Relief and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

The World Alliance brought together the representatives of the Eastern Churches in Switzerland in 1920. This was the first time that such a delegation had met in conference with the members of the Western Churches. Another conference of leaders of all the Eastern Churches was held at Sinaia, Roumania, in 1924. The Patriarch of Constantinople and the heads of the Churches in the various Eastern countries, serving as permanent officers of the World Alliance give a constant contact between the Eastern and Western Churches. Too much cannot be said of the work of the late Robert H. Gardiner in bringing about a closer relationship between the Eastern and Western Churches. He was a pioneer in the conception that there could be a closer union between these groups and gave his life to its fulfillment.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has recently appointed a standing Committee on Relations with the Eastern Churches and at the last annual meeting of its Executive Committee representatives of the Eastern Churches had an important place on the program. A representative was sent by the Federal Council in the winter of 1921-22 into Russia to carry gifts that had been made by the American churches to the destitute clergy in Russia. Special efforts have also been made by the Federal Council to assist the Christian minorities in the Near East. The effort of the independent Committee on the Preservation of the Sacred Places in the Holy Land to help the Jerusalem Patriarchate is another concrete exhibition of brotherly sympathy.

As a result of these various influences making for closer fellowship between the East and the West there is being visualized more clearly the ideal of a united front not only for the Churches of the West but also for the Churches of Christendom, so far as they are willing to join in some kind of association or international council.

IV. ACHIEVEMENTS AND LESSONS IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The experience in cooperation as thus far described has been, in the main, the experience of the churches within the boundaries of a single nation. The rise of the foreign missionary movement has led the churches of the West into a world-wide ministry of helpfulness to other lands, but we have still to consider the development of any organized cooperation transcending national lines (except for a very limited cooperation between the United States and Canada). In entering upon this wider field, needless to say we encounter incalculably more difficult problems. The vastly greater extent of territory, the far wider range of divergences of view and practice, and, even more, the existence of strong nationalistic feelings and misunderstandings bring us face to face with an issue of tremendous proportions.

But the dimensions of the problem, when it is one of such paramount importance to the whole church, should be only a challenge to commensurate faith. And, happily, we are not without convincing evidence, even in this world field, of the practicability of cooperation. Indeed, the experience in international as well as interdenominational cooperation among the Churches is far greater than is usually recognized. A recent American volume entitled "International Christian Movements" lists and describes over thirty organizations of a denominational, interdenominational, or voluntary character, all of which are, in varying degrees, manifestations of the spirit of international unity among the evangelical churches, for the most part expressing the ideal of united service which is the subject of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. The Christian movement, it is not too much to say, is steadily becoming international as well as interdenominational.

The undenominational organizations, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, have long had far-reaching world relationships, too well known to require comment. The World's Student Christian Federation for more than twenty-five years has been bringing students from all parts of the earth into closer fellowship and service. The Sunday School Movement and the Christian Endeavor Society have world organizations.

1. International Associations of the Denominations

The denominations themselves have been assuming a more œcumenical character, not only as a result of the missionary enterprise, which has extended their interest to all parts of the globe, but also as an outcome of the international gatherings of the members of the denominations from many lands at stated intervals during the last fifty years. As far back as 1867 the first Conference of Anglican Bishops throughout the world was held at Lambeth. The World Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System dates from 1875. Œcumenical Methodist Conference, from 1881. The International Congre-

gational Council (1891), the Baptist World Alliance (1905), and the Lutheran World Convention (1923) are more recent instances of the same general movement, which is giving an international outlook and ministering to international fellowship in each of the large denominations.

2. International Missionary Council

It is in the foreign missionary movement, as would naturally be expected, that the churches have first come to an official organization that is both interdenominational and international in character. The very nature of the missionary enterprise has been a prophecy of such a world-wide agency as the International Missionary Council, created in 1920. The way for the Council was prepared by the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. When the war made impossible the full fellowship represented by the Continuation Committee, an "emergency committee" undertook such international functions as were possible. In June, 1920, following many consultations of missionary leaders of different countries, there was held at Crans, Switzerland, a conference of delegates representing the various active national missionary organizations, at which the International Missionary Council was projected on a truly representative international basis. The Council is a delegated body, elected by the national missionary organizations of North America, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Germany, France, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Belgium, and the various mission fields.

The first regular meeting of the Council, as thus projected, was held at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., in October, 1921, eleven national organizations being represented. This Council formulated a constitution, which was referred to the constituent national organizations for approval, adopted a budget for the following biennium and elected officers. It assumed full responsibility for the publication of the *International Missionary Review*, established permanent headquarters at London and adopted the following four-fold statement of its purposes:

1. To stimulate thinking and investigation on missionary questions, to enlist in the solution of these questions the best knowledge and experience to be found in all countries, and to make the results available for all missionary societies and missions.

2. To help to co-ordinate the activities of the national missionary organizations of the different countries and of the societies they represent, and to bring united action where necessary in missionary matters.

3. Through common consultation to help to unite Christian public opinion in support of freedom of conscience and religion and of missionary liberty.

4. To help to unite the Christian forces of the world in seeking justice in international and interracial relations.

The last meeting of the Council, at Oxford, England, in July, 1923, marked significant progress in furthering these objectives.

The action of the Council is advisory only, for its organization is based on the principle "that the only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the missionary societies and boards or the churches which they represent, and the churches in the mission field." The Council is, however, constantly engaged in special studies and phases of work which are of the utmost value to all the participating societies.

3. International Relations of Federations

A new international relationship among the churches as a whole has lately been springing up through the development of national Federal Councils, or other federated bodies, and their fraternal relationships with each other. There are now such bodies in Great Britain, Switzerland, France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Czecho-Slovakia, Australia, Japan, China and America, with all of which the Federal Council in America has established relationships. In some other countries the cooperative movement among the churches exists in the simpler form of joint committees.

The interests of these national councils or federations have become so clearly mutual that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has appointed a secretary, resident in Europe, whose entire time and service have been placed at the disposal of the European bodies, mainly in the interest of relief for needy nations and churches. The Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches in Europe, through which these relationships are carried on, is, we believe, the first concerted approach toward a cooperative agency of official church bodies of Europe. While organized for a particular purpose, it has at the same time a stimulating influence on other cooperative and federative movements in Europe. It might perhaps even prove to be a stage on the way to a Federal Council of European Churches.

Matters of world concern, such as are undertaken by the League of Nations and its humanitarian commissions are frequently the subjects of conference, correspondence or cable messages between the federated church bodies of several countries. A striking example has been the frequent contacts between the Federation of Japanese Churches and the American Federal Council in the effort to develop friendship and understanding between the two nations. The departments of social service and inner mission work in several national federations have also found large common elements in their problems.

4. International Relations Through the World Alliance for International Friendship

The World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, with Councils in twenty-eight countries, has become an indispensable and effective agent of Christian cooperation across national

lines in the great common task of securing world peace. Its service in ministering to international understanding and goodwill has been inestimable. In most of the countries of Europe the councils of the World Alliance are appointed by the authority of the churches, so that they are in a position to represent the churches officially in matters pertaining to world peace and friendship.

5. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work is itself a significant expression of the international cooperative movement as a whole and will doubtless be expected to consider its further development in the way of organization.

V. PRINCIPLES WHICH SHOULD GOVERN THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATION

From the past experience of the churches in cooperation certain principles emerge which have been found essential and which should clearly guide us in further developments. The more important of these principles may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The cooperation needed must be positive. It must grow out of definite convictions held in common and a definite purpose and a unity of spirit shared. Since the revelation which God has made of himself in Jesus Christ is the central truth of Christianity, any cooperative movement that is to express adequately the life of the churches must rest upon a common conviction concerning Him as Lord and Saviour, grow out of real experience of life with Him and express itself in unselfish service in His name.

2. Unity must be understood to be very different from uniformity. A sign of life in a tree is that it divides continually into branches and twigs. The principle is that there is one trunk and many branches, for "as we have many members in one body and all members have not the same office, so we being many are one body in Christ, and everyone members one of another." Our Lord's word, "I am the vine, ye are the branches," indicates that diversity in unity is necessary for flowers and fruit. There was a time when the church sought to coerce all its members into using the same forms and the same language for purposes of worship, but when new life came in through the Reformation diversity began to manifest itself, within a common unity in essentials.

3. Interdenominational cooperation must rest on an inclusive rather than an exclusive basis. It must recognize and make room for the richness of historic tradition and of religious experience which the various groups of Christian believers can bring. We must aim at comprehension, not at omission or elision.

4. It is possible to cooperate without reference to organic union. Cooperation is practicable on the basis of the spirit of unity already

existing, should grow naturally out of it and will prepare the way for still larger unity. Indeed, a larger measure of union is likely to come only as the result of the increasing fellowship, understanding and trust that spring from joining hand-in-hand in common tasks.

5. The larger cooperation and unity required are best produced along the two following lines of endeavor:

- (a) Seeking such spiritual awakening as will bring all who are federated into so complete a union with Christ that they will discover that they are closely united to each other as members of Christ's body. It is this which more than anything else will remove competition and unfriendly rivalry among Christians.
- (b) Presenting to the federated bodies so great and inspiring a task that they will allow no minor differences to stand in the way of a united performance of that task. It is for this reason that the missionary movement has been such an inspirer of cooperation. It has brought the church back to the point of view which transcends all national boundaries, and recognizes as brothers the men of every race, color, or stage of civilization.

6. Cooperation and federation are possible with full freedom in expression. This is seen, for example, in the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in which nearly twenty million Protestant communicants join in common programs without experiencing any external coercion of any sort and without sacrificing anything of what any denomination regards as essential. Illustrations are also at hand in the Foreign Missions Conference of North America and other interdenominational organizations.

7. A true denominationalism and interdenominationalism are not antithetical. No federation can ever become effective and powerful if the denominational units that comprise it are weak and inefficient. The spirit of sectarianism is, of course, fatal to cooperation, but a growing sense of unity within each denomination and a clear recognition by each denomination of its corporate responsibility should minister to a readiness to join with others in great tasks that no denomination can achieve alone. One of the obstacles to interdenominational cooperation in the past has been the lack of unity within many a denomination itself. Whatever truly unites Christians more closely within each denomination will lead to that larger unity which united them to their fellow Christians of other names.

8. A cooperative movement ought to be directly representative of the churches themselves and ought to be directly responsible to them. Otherwise it can not truly speak or act in the name of the denominations. Unless its policies and programs are controlled by the denominations, through properly accredited representatives, it cannot hope to retain permanently their confidence and trust. The interdenominational program, whatever form it takes ought to be such that it will be regarded by each of the cooperating bodies as being as truly its own as the work done within the denomination itself.

VI. ADVANCED STEPS NOW CALLED FOR

In general, it may be said that there are five clearly discernible and urgently necessary measures of further advance before us.

1. The Christian denominations separately, and in consequence associatedly, must discern more clearly than they do the true functions of the church, its duties and its problems.

2. The Christian denominations in each nation need some central agency of cooperation possessing full trust and responsibility, controlled and directed by them.

3. The denominations possessing and directing this agency should use it fully and discharge through it their common duties, instead of leaving them to independent, undenominational agencies which act either in part or not at all in the name of the church.

4. Between the churches of all lands there should be developed international understanding and fellowship, with such international instrumentalities as are necessary for the discharge of the international duties of the churches.

5. Interdenominational and international cooperation is possible only when men trust one another and have in their central loyalty to Christ a bond of union stronger than any of the tendencies of division.

The problems which these advanced steps involve in the field of interdenominational action are not different in kind from those which exist inside each denomination. Interdenominational trust and unity, even international trust and unity, rest on the same principles as intradenominational trust and unity. They all involve one simple problem, can the diversity of the body be preserved in the unity of the Head?

That there is an indispensable need for some international organization of the Christian forces seems to us too obvious to admit of doubt. Such an organization, it must be made entirely clear, should have no external authority over any denomination. On the contrary its own authority must come only from the common counsels and agreements among the denominations or national groups that comprise it. As to the particular form or method of organization that will best minister to the world's need there will probably be difference of opinion. The following appear to be possible forms that the proposed organizations might take, growing out of the experience recorded in the previous pages of this report.

1. An international undenominational alliance; that is, an agency whose membership should be drawn from the churches of all lands but without any official capacity or delegated responsibility. Such an organization, while doubtless the most easy to form, could hardly give adequate expression to the fundamental principles that we have considered above.

2. An international alliance of denominational international agencies; that is, some kind of comprehensive association comprising such units as the Lambeth Conference, the Lutheran World Convention, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, the Methodist Œcumenical Conference and the Baptist World Alliance. It must be borne in mind, however, that these denominational alliances are themselves very loosely organized and that a body formed from them would necessarily be looser still.

3. An international council of national denominations. This would afford the most directly representative form of organization. The most serious problem would arise from the great number of denominations in most countries and the difficulty of securing the presence of so many representatives at international meetings.

4. An international council of national Federations of Churches; that is, an inclusive council composed of the representatives of bodies like the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the French Protestant Federation, the Deutsche Evangelische Kirchen Bund, the Swiss Federation of Churches, and the official agencies of interchurch cooperation in the other lands. There are, of course, important countries in which no such council or federation exists, but it may well be doubted whether the churches of these lands would be likely to join in effective cooperation internationally until they had first begun to deal cooperatively with their own problems at home. The existence and work of an international council, moreover, would probably serve as a stimulus to the establishment of national councils in countries where they have not yet developed.

This international cooperation—whatever be the form it takes—will be furthered and in no sense impaired, by the maximum achievement of cooperation or union in more limited areas or among smaller groups. Whatever progress toward unity may be made, for example, among the various Methodist Churches or the various Presbyterian Churches in America; whatever may be accomplished in bringing together all the churches of a single nation, like Canada; whatever may be done to strengthen the bonds between the branches of the same denominational family in different nations of the world, will all contribute to the larger goal we seek.

Finally it must be kept constantly in mind that certain habits of mind and qualities of spirit both promote and are promoted by cooperative service. These habits of mind should be sedulously cultivated—"the habit of thinking of others' interests as if they were our own, of trying to enter into the nature of their experience and to see things as they see them, of inculcating in those whom we can influence this catholic and sympathetic spirit, and of making place for it in our educational program and in our religious publications; above all, of complete frankness and confidence in our dealing with one another."

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities**, by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook (appointed by Federal Council of the Churches). Published by Association Press.
- International Christian Movements**. Edited by Charles S. Macfarland. Published by Fleming H. Revell Company.
- The Progress of Church Federation**, by Charles S. Macfarland. Published by Fleming H. Revell Company.
- The Year Book of the Churches**. Edited by E. O. Watson. Published by the Federal Council of the Churches.
- Community Programs for Cooperating Churches**. Edited by Roy B. Guild. Published by Association Press.
- The Churches Allied for Common Tasks**. (Report of the Federal Council of the Churches for the Quadrennium, 1916-1920.) Edited by Samuel McCrea Cavert.
- The Origin and History of the Federal Council**, by Elias B. Sanford. Published by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
- The Christian Unity Movement in America**, by Frederick Lynch. Published by James Clark & Co., London.
- Practising Christian Unity**, by Roy B. Guild. Published by Association Press, New York.
- The Church in America**, by William Adams Brown. Published by Macmillan. (Especially chapters 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13).
- The Federal Council Bulletin**, published bi-monthly by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.